



# Cornell University Library

BOUGHT WITH THE INCOME  
FROM THE  
SAGE ENDOWMENT FUND  
THE GIFT OF

**Henry W. Sage**

1891

A, 85/68

26/8/95



Cornell University  
Library

The original of this book is in  
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in  
the United States on the use of the text.









*An Attempt to illustrate those Articles of the  
Church of England, which the Calvinists  
improperly consider as Calvinistical,*

IN

# EIGHT SERMONS

PREACHED BEFORE

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

IN THE YEAR MDCCCIV,

AT

THE LECTURE

FOUNDED BY J. BAMPTON, M. A.

CANON OF SALISBURY.

---

BY

RICHARD LAURENCE, LL. D.  
OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.

---

OXFORD,

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, FOR THE AUTHOR ;  
AND SOLD BY MESSRS. HANWELL AND PARKER ; AND BY  
MESSRS. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND  
R. FAULDER, NEW BOND STREET, LONDON.

1804.



## ERRATA.

- Page 36, lin. 15. after the word *perhaps* add *from*.  
 — 184, — 7. for *homines* read *hominis*.  
 — 191, — 17. after the word *work* add *Supplement, p. 142*.  
 — 192, — 29, 30. dele inverted commas.  
 — 193, — 21. after the word *May* add 1543.  
 — 208, — 5. for *and* read *Andr.*  
 — 238, — 19. for *audiendum* read *audendum*.  
 — 241, — 3. for *Ecclesiæ* read *Ecclesiarum*.  
 — 249, — 30. for *dabant* read *dabunt*.  
 — 251, — 6. for 1533 read 1535.  
 — 274, — 31. dele *it.*  
 — 277, — 14. for *figelli* read *figilli*.  
 — 280, — 6. for *pietas* read *peflus*.  
 — 289, — 27. after the word *viliſſima* add *donumque*.  
 — 302, — 5. for *Serm. I.* read *Serm. II.*  
 — 316, — 34. for *vocamur* read *vocamus*.  
 — 318, — 14. for *cogitare* read *cogitari*.  
 — 352, — 29. for *regnæ* read *regni*.  
 — 397, — 27. for *habeat* read *habeant*.





---

## P R E F A C E.

THE mode of illustration adopted in these Lectures, although it has not been wholly disregarded, has nevertheless been but partially pursued, by those, who have gone before upon the same subject. Much has been written, and satisfactorily written, to prove, that the Predestinarian system of Calvin is totally inconsistent with the doctrine of our Articles; that it is equally irreconcilable with our Liturgy and Homilies; and that the private sentiments of our Reformers were likewise inimical to it. But complete in all points as such evidence may appear, (the force of which its opponents have been unable to invalidate,) the Author still conceived, that an elucidation of another kind was wanting; that the weight of testimony might be augmented by an attempt to trace the Articles, usually controverted on the occasion,

h

caſion,

caſion, up to their genuine ſources, to compare them with the peculiar opinions of their own times, and thus to determine their meaning with more certainty, by aſcertaining the preciſe objects, which their compilers had in view. This attempt he has made in the Bampton Lectures of the year. As, however, in compositions of their nature a minute detail of particulars was not practicable, and yet as he felt himſelf both in reaſon and in duty bound to fulfil the intentions of the Founder, by printing (professedly as Lectures) only that, which in point of quantity and form, as well as ſubſtance, was actually delivered from the pulpit, he has been under the neceſſity of adding notes; and of adding them to a conſiderable extent, becauſe his argument principally reſted upon authorities, derived from productions not generally read, nor every where attainable.

---

E X T R A C T

FROM THE

LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

OF THE LATE

REV. JOHN BAMPTON,

CANON OF SALISBURY.

——“ I give and bequeath my Lands and  
“ Estates to the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars  
“ of the University of Oxford for ever, to have  
“ and to hold all and singular the said Lands or  
“ Estates upon trust, and to the intents and pur-  
“ poses hereinafter mentioned; that is to say, I  
“ will and appoint that the Vice-Chancellor of  
“ the University of Oxford for the time being shall  
“ take and receive all the rents, issues, and pro-  
“ fits thereof, and (after all taxes, reparations, and  
“ necessary deductions made) that he pay all the  
“ remainder to the endowment of eight Divinity  
“ Lecture Sermons, to be established for ever in  
“ the said University, and to be performed in the  
“ manner following :

“ I direct and appoint, that, upon the first  
“ Tuesday in Easter Term, a Lecturer be yearly  
b 2 “ chosen

“ chosen by the Heads of Colleges only, and by  
 “ no others, in the room adjoining to the Print-  
 “ ing-House, between the hours of ten in the  
 “ morning and two in the afternoon, to preach  
 “ eight Divinity Lecture Sermons, the year fol-  
 “ lowing, at St. Mary’s in Oxford, between the  
 “ commencement of the last month in Lent Term,  
 “ and the end of the third week in Act Term,

“ Also I direct and appoint, that the eight Di-  
 “ vinity Lecture Sermons shall be preached upon  
 “ either of the following Subjects—to confirm  
 “ and establish the Christian Faith, and to con-  
 “ fute all heretics and schismatics—upon the di-  
 “ vine authority of the holy Scriptures—upon  
 “ the authority of the writings of the primitive  
 “ Fathers, as to the faith and practice of the pri-  
 “ mitive Church—upon the Divinity of our  
 “ Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—upon the Di-  
 “ vinity of the Holy Ghost—upon the Articles  
 “ of the Christian Faith, as comprehended in the  
 “ Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds.

“ Also I direct, that thirty copies of the eight  
 “ Divinity Lecture Sermons shall be always  
 “ printed, within two months after they are  
 “ preached, and one copy shall be given to the  
 “ Chancellor of the University, and one copy to  
 “ the Head of every College, and one copy to the  
 “ Mayor of the city of Oxford, and one copy to  
 “ be put into the Bodleian Library ; and the ex-  
 “ pence







# CONTENTS.

---

## SERMON I.

*The general principles of the Reformation, from its commencement, to the period when our Articles were composed, shewn to be of a Lutheran tendency.*

## SERMON II.

*The same tendency pointed out in the Articles themselves, as deducible from the history of their compilation.*

## SERMON III.

*On Original Sin, as maintained by the Scholastics, the Lutherans, and our own Reformers.*

## SERMON IV.

*On the tenet of the Schools respecting Merit de Congruo, and that of the Lutherans in opposition to it.*

## SERMON V.

*The Articles “of Free Will,” and “of Works before Justification,” explained in connexion with the preceding controversy.*

## SERMON VI.

*On the Scholastical doctrine of Justification, the Lutheran, and that of our own Church.*

## SERMON VII.

*The outline of the Predestinarian system stated, as taught in the Schools, and as christianized by Luther and Melancthon.*

## SERMON VIII.

*The 17th Article considered in conformity with the sentiments of the latter, and elucidated by our Baptismal service. Brief recapitulation of the whole.*

---

## S E R M O N I.

2 TIMOTHY iii. 14.

*But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them.*

**T**HAT no investigations are more important than those, which Religion points out, is a truth admitted indeed by all, but felt only by the wise and good. Other enquiries we may pursue or omit, as individual inclination prompts us, while with respect to our future existence we prosecute them without profit, or neglect them without danger; but the case of Religion permits no alternative. Here not inclination but duty and interest are to be consulted. This is a subject upon the cultivation of which depends the welfare of our being beyond the grave; which it is the extreme of folly to forget, and of madness to despise.

Educated in a Christian community, with a reverence for the precepts of the Gospel,

we imbibe in early years an habitual predilection for its doctrines. When the faculties of the soul expand, and reason approaches maturity, this predilection becomes augmented, in proportion as we weigh with more or less accuracy the irrefragable arguments, which have been repeatedly urged in its defence since the happy æra of the Reformation. For it is the pride of Englishmen to reflect, that the principles of Christianity have been no where discussed with more candour and ability, or with more clearness, solidity, and force of conviction, than in their own country. But every good is attended with a correspondent evil. The Reformation, which in order to expose error encouraged freedom of enquiry, unavoidably occasioned an almost infinite variety of opinions, as the points of view became different, under which the same objects were contemplated. One system however only could be established; and to that, which was at first adopted, we still adhere. Hence it happens, that we find ourselves not merely Christians, but Protestants, and not Protestants only, but members of a particular Church, the distinguishing tenets of which, if we choose to preserve our connexion with it, we seem bound without dissimulation to profess, and in our consciences to believe.

If

If such be the obligation even of the Laity, the Clergy surely ought to be sensible of one more strict, as well as extensive ; they should consider themselves as appointed not simply to teach Religion by precept, and adorn it by example, but at all times to support the faith of that Church, to which they belong, without lukewarmness and without inconsistency. The humblest attempt therefore to elucidate any controverted points of our national Creed cannot perhaps prove totally uninteresting in this place, where its value is duly appreciated, and where all, it is presumed, feel equally influenced by deliberate choice, as by consistency of character, to protect it from injury and insult.

When the nature of academical institutions and their close connexion with the Church are considered, no public discordance of sentiment can here be expected to prevail ; here can we approve and teach only authorized opinions ; and here a sense of honour no less than of duty prevents the most forward from attempting to subvert, by concealed and insidious stratagems, what none can openly attack. But as soon as we go abroad into the world, and converse with Christians of different persuasions, with some, who feel as proud a distinction in being

B 2

without,

without, as we do in being within, the pale of our Establishment, the unanimity, which before we witnessed, disappears: a scene of discord succeeds; and perhaps upon topics where we expected immediate concession, we are surprised by a pertinacious opposition; where we supposed liberality to exist, we sometimes find prejudice; and where prejudice, sometimes liberality; where we looked for indifference, we are encountered with zeal; and where we could conceive nothing but weakness, if we do not always discover wisdom, we often admire address and applaud ingenuity. It may not therefore appear foreign to the design of these Lectures, if I direct your attention to those particular Doctrines of our Church, which Dissenters of every denomination, how widely soever they differ from each other, agree to object against us, as Doctrines, which either we do not understand, or understanding, choose not to believe.

In the standard of Faith, which our Articles exhibit, a peculiar class of opinions is to be found, which seem to have been variously argued at various periods, and which during more than one century interested in the highest degree, and interesting disunited the Christian world; those I mean, which are usually supposed to be more or less allied to the Predesti-  
narian



narian controversy. Interpreting them according to the modern meaning of certain expressions, and disregarding the characteristical notions of the times, in which they were first established, the Socinian and the Calvinist combine in giving them a sense, which they were not originally intended to convey ; and then accuse us of departing from the creed of our ancestors, of disbelieving that, to which in this place at least we have all subscribed. Thus, to whichever side we turn, we perceive each party in array against us ; the one preferring the charge with sarcastical contempt ; the other with a mingled sensation of anger and pity ; and both with apparently a confident persuasion of our apostasy. To the Articles, which embrace these particular points, I propose to restrict my enquiries. In the pursuit however of this object it will not be necessary to explore those endless labyrinths, in which the century subsequent to the Reformation, one not unproductive either of talents or of literature, was perplexed and bewildered : my plan will solely be, after pointing out whence the Doctrines of our Church in general were derived, to trace such as will be selected for examination up to their genuine sources.

In discussing with impartiality questions of

a remote æra it is requisite, but not easy, to discard modern prepossessions; to place ourselves exactly in the situation and under the circumstances of those, whose sentiments we wish to investigate, and display with fidelity. On such occasions we are usually too much disposed to throw in light, where we perceive only an indistinct mass of shade, or at least to revive that which in our eyes appears faint and faded, endeavouring in every instance to improve according to our own taste and fancy, instead of faithfully exhibiting the simpler productions of antiquity. But the subject before me is attended with another difficulty. From its peculiar nature it is confined to disquisitions, which, having lost at this distant period their immediate importance, and ceased to interest us, it seems almost impossible again to bring forward without fatiguing the attention, and appearing to clog the argument with much heavy detail, and which can seldom afford an opportunity for the diffusion of ornament, for popular dissertation, or for elegant composition. From these considerations, when imperfections appear, some indulgence perhaps, beyond what the candour of criticism usually grants, may be extended to them.

When the Articles of our Church have been reviewed by writers, either professedly  
or

or incidentally undertaking to explain their meaning, they have generally received an interpretation rather accommodated to recent controversies, than to such as existed at the period of their compilation. Whatsoever ready conjecture could devise, or ingenious deduction supply, to maintain the appearance of strict conformity in principle, without sacrificing the reputation of a name or the credit of an opinion, has been advanced in this way. Nor has the attempt in every instance proved fruitless; but has added much to the vindication of the common cause of Protestantism, as well as of the liberality and moderation of the English Church. It is nevertheless to be lamented that the enquiry has not always been conducted with temper and impartiality. When however we perceive, that some things have been insinuated on both sides, which every good man would wish to forget; that both have indulged in personal and party reflexions, which it would have been wiser to suppress; we should recollect that the case is common; that through the polemical discussion of the most sacred truths human passions will diffuse their malignant poison; and that the charity of Theological disputants is seldom of the most amiable kind, and never very abundant. On one

hand it has been contended, that our Articles are consonant with the Creed of Calvin ; on the other with that of Arminius. It is not my intention to follow this controverted question into particulars. Yet perhaps it should be cursorily remarked, that even the Calvinist has proved in the most convincing mode, that they are not in their necessary construction completely Calvinistical ; that something is wanting in them to produce entire satisfaction ; for repeatedly has he laboured, although constantly laboured in vain, first to render them explicit on this head, and afterwards to get his favourite emendations approved and established by public authority (<sup>1</sup>). But with these points the elucidation, which I propose, is by no means connected. It will be confined to a comparison of our Articles with the prevailing opinions of the times when they were composed, at least with those in which they immediately originated, or from which they were collaterally derived.

If we contemplate them in this view, or rather such of them as will become the subject of investigation, we find, that far from being framed according to the system of Calvin in preference to all others, they were modelled after the Lutheran in opposition  
to

to the Romish tenets of the day. The whole scope therefore of my design will be, instead of considering them abstractedly, to survey them relatively, with reference to the particular tenets alluded to ; and the principal part of my observations will consist in developing these, if not minutely and in full detail, yet sufficiently for the purpose of illustration. But before I proceed to explain the selected doctrines, it will be requisite more at large to point out the real basis upon which the superstructure of our Church was raised ; and then to give the evidence which the Articles themselves exhibit of having been erected upon the same foundation.

It is well known to all, who have bestowed the least attention upon its history, that our Reformation was a progressive work, commenced in the reign of Henry, and completed under his successor in all its essential parts, without suffering any subsequent alteration of importance. The original, after which in almost every instance it was moulded, as far as the arbitrary will of the Monarch, or the prejudices of the Clergy, and people permitted, was avowedly the Protestant establishment in Germany. Against the Church of Rome, which always, when attacked, fled for protection to the shield of scholastical sophistry,

Luther

Luther had waged a dauntless, unwearied, and effectual warfare. He entered the field of combat without distrust or apprehension, under a rooted persuasion, that the victory over superstition would prove easy at an æra, when learning had already begun to extend itself in every direction, and was become closely allied to theological attainments (<sup>2</sup>). It has been frequently remarked, that the dawn of reformation was the dawn of letters. Religion and literature had long been overwhelmed in darkness; and although at different periods they faintly struggled to emerge from obscurity, yet were their efforts unavailing, only rendering the gloom, which surrounded them, still more visible, until the fulness of their time arrived, until the same divine goodness, which first gave life to the animal and light to the intellectual creation, commanded them to resume their former splendor, and with united rays to illuminate and adorn the world. The sacred books, which contain the records of Christianity, no less than the writings of its earlier champions, had been almost wholly neglected during a long reign of disputatious ignorance in several preceding centuries. But when the light of day appeared, the genuine doctrines of Scripture and the primitive opinions of  
anti-



antiquity began to be more distinctly perceived, and more accurately investigated. With an attachment to classical pursuits arose a zeal for biblical enquiries. Taste and Truth went hand in hand. Religion gave interest and importance to literature, and literature afforded no inconsiderable assistance in restoring and purifying Religion. At every period prior to the sixteenth century, all who had laboured with the hazard of their lives to reform the Church, had uniformly failed in their attempts, not so much from any deficiency in their argument, as from the contracted sphere of public information, and the incurable bigotry of the public mind: but at the revival of letters, no means of success were wanting; zeal and ability were equally conspicuous; the diffusion of knowledge became every where more and more general; and with it were diffused the plain and simple truths of the long neglected Gospel.

In this country, where the light of literature could not be concealed, nor the love of truth suppressed, Lutheranism found numerous profelytes, who were known by the appellation <sup>(3)</sup> of "the men of the new learning." This was particularly the case after the rupture with the See of Rome. For when  
Henry

Henry had shaken off the Papal yoke, and undertaken to reform the doctrine of the English Church, it began to spread with rapidity. It then boldly fought and obtained not only protection but patronage from the Crown itself. Henry, who is usually represented as having almost always acted from the suggestion of the moment, and as having enthroned his passions above his reason, but who certainly never sacrificed what he conceived to be his conscience or prerogative to the will of others, fostered and supported its general principles; and, the more effectually to propagate them in his dominions, and to accelerate the arduous task in which he had engaged, invited hither a Divine, in whose admirable erudition, as he remarked, and sound judgment all good men placed their hopes, the ever memorable Melancthon (\*). That he solicited not the assistance of Luther on this occasion should not perhaps be solely attributed to his personal dislike of that Reformer; he well knew, that the Protestant princes themselves at the most critical period had manifested a greater partiality for Melancthon. Luther, than whom no one was more capable of infusing energy into the cause, in which he had embarked, was of all men the worst adapted to conduct it with moderation:

moderation: he was calculated to commence, but not to complete reformation. Prompt, resolute, and impetuous, he laboured with distinguished success in the demolition of long established error; he also hastily threw together the rough and cumbrous materials of a better system: but the office of selecting, modelling, and arranging them was consigned to a correcter hand. Melancthon was of a character directly opposite to that of Luther, possessing every requisite to render truth alluring and reformation respectable; and hence upon him in preference the Princes of Germany conferred the honour of compiling the public profession of their faith. When Henry therefore applied for the assistance of this favourite Divine, by seeking the aid of one, to whom Lutheranism had been indebted for her creed, he placed beyond suspicion the nature of that change, which he meditated.

But the predilection of this country for the principles, to which I allude, was not confined to a mere distant correspondence for the purpose of acquiring information, and promoting discussion, or to a frequent solicitation of foreign assistance; an actual Reform founded upon them took place; and some popular instructions were either published with permission,

mission, or sanctioned by royal authority, which, with the exception of a few points only, breathed the spirit of Lutheranism (<sup>s</sup>). Of this no one at all conversant with the subject can for a moment doubt, who examines with attention the contents, of what were at the time denominated the Bishops Book; and the King's Book, the two most important publications of the day. And, although in both these systems of faith (for such avowedly they were) some superstitious tenets may be discovered, which were afterwards rejected; yet little, if any thing, is to be found in either of them materially different from what was subsequently established, relative to any point, with which my proposed enquiry is connected. Indeed the Reformation of the succeeding reign ought not to be considered as distinct from that which had been effected in this, but rather as a continuation and completion of it. In proof of which, without advertng to general resemblances, it seems sufficient to remark, that three of our existing Articles, two, which relate to the Sacraments, and one respecting Traditions, were in a great measure copied word for word from a short code of doctrines, which had been drawn up long before the death of Henry (<sup>6</sup>). Nor  
is

is complete originality even here to be met with ; the sentiments, and many of the very expressions, thus borrowed, being themselves evidently derived from another source, the Confession of Augsbourg.

When Edward then ascended the throne, the same attachment not only continued to prevail, but became more predominant, unfettered by the caprices of the ruling Monarch. The offices of our Church were immediately reformed (which before had been but partially attempted) after the temperate system of Luther, and not after the plan of subversion, rather than of reformation, which Calvin had recently exhibited at Geneva (<sup>7</sup>). Nor were any alterations of importance, one point alone excepted, made at their subsequent revision. At the same period also, the first book of Homilies was composed ; which, although equally Lutheran, yet containing nothing upon the subject of the Sacramental presence, has remained without the slightest emendation to the present day. The benefit of Melancthon's personal services was again and again solicited ; but they seem to have been too highly valued at home to be transplanted into a foreign country (<sup>8</sup>). Another circumstance likewise, which seems to have been little noticed, no less directly  
proves,

proves the favourite quarter, to which our Reformers looked for information. Cranmer, who had never concealed the bias of his sentiments, now more openly and generally avowed them. He translated a Lutheran Catechism, which he edited in his own name, dedicated to the King, and recommended in the strongest terms, as a treatise admirably adapted to improve the principles as well as morals of the rising generation (<sup>o</sup>).

The opinions therefore of the Primate were at this time perfectly Lutheran; and although he afterwards changed them in one single point, in other respects they remained unaltered. And it should be recollected, that he it was, who principally conducted our Reformation from its earliest commencement under Henry to its termination in the reign of Edward, exerting his influence over the mind of the former, and his credit in the councils of the latter, to effect that which it was the prayer of his heart and the pride of his life to behold advancing towards perfection. Almost the whole merit of our ecclesiastical renovation must be imputed to him, who, stilling the chaos of theological contention, produced harmony from discord, and beauty from deformity. To ascertain his peculiar attachments is to ascertain those  
of

of the Reformation ; for under his direction, and with much of his individual aid, were prepared the Offices of our Church and the Articles of her Creed.

If his conduct, connexions, and writings are duly considered, little doubt will exist with regard to the tendency of his principles ; nor ought his zeal for Lutheranism to be deemed questionable, because he patronized talents, wherever he found them, and respected good men of all persuasions. For his views were enlarged and liberal beyond his times ; his heart and his purse were open to ability of every description : nor, although a strenuous advocate of truth, was he ever uncharitably and inflexibly severe towards those who persisted in error, but exercised on all occasions a patience and forbearance, which his very enemies applauded, but which few of his friends were disposed to imitate. Actuated by a conviction, that what he advanced in the cause of Christianity his conscience, as he energetically expressed himself, would be able to defend at the great day in the sight of the everliving God (<sup>10</sup>), he was by no means wavering and unsteady in his sentiments ; yet at the same time, experiencing how reluctantly the human mind relinquished inveterate habits, he felt compassion in-

c

stead

stead of resentment for the prejudices of Papists, relieving them by his bounty when distressed, and honouring them with his friendship when deserving it. Towards Protestants, as might have been expected, his munificence was unlimited. Neither was he scrupulously solicitous to discriminate between those, who supported different tenets on inferior points: to Zuinglians no less than Lutherans, uncharitable towards each other, his hand was incessantly extended, and his house afforded a common asylum in calamity.

But whatsoever we may conceive his principles to have been, it should be remarked, that a writer of eminence seems to withhold from them no small share of supposed public influence, by representing him as having been incapable of displaying them with ability. The principal Historian of our Reformation asserts, that he possessed no great quickness of apprehension, nor any closeness of style, which was diffused and unconnected; and that, conscious of his deficiencies, he borrowed the assistance of a more able pen, when any thing was to be drawn up, which required nervous composition ("). This censure, which, if just, would considerably diminish the importance of his aid in the compilation as well of our Articles, as of our Homilies and



and Liturgy, were it less allied to my subject than it really is, the love of truth and a due regard to the memory of one, who has endeared his name to every true Protestant, would not suffer me to pass by wholly unnoticed.

If we consult the testimony of his contemporaries, with the exception of such only as was given by those, who wrote from party spirit, and experienced an interest in misrepresenting him, we shall find, that he was never reputed to be deficient in quickness of apprehension; but, on the other hand, that his parts and acquisitions were deservedly held in the highest estimation (<sup>12</sup>). Yet even this is unnecessary. Let us but examine with impartiality his celebrated work upon the Sacrament, and all further enquiry will prove superfluous. In this production the great stores of theological literature, with which his capacious mind was enriched, were exhibited in a manner, which places his reasoning powers in the most conspicuous light; which proves, that the clearness of his conception, his acuteness in discrimination, and his address in argument, were equal to the extent of his information; and that, distinguished by an unsophisticated regard for truth, he possessed the singular faculty of per-

c 2

suading

suading without any apparent attempt to persuade, and without art by candour alone of enforcing conviction.

Neither did any defect in composition disgrace his controversial talent. For if we consult what ought only to be consulted on the occasion, those works which he professedly composed for the public eye, we shall perceive that his expression wanted not nerve to strengthen it; and that his periods were by no means unconnected, nor (when it is considered that he wrote upon subjects and for purposes requiring some expansion) unnecessarily diffused (<sup>13</sup>). That he excelled not in that artificial compression of style, which some esteem the standard of perfection, will be readily granted; because he excelled in something better, in nature and simplicity. But while he cultivated simplicity, he by no means neglected concinnity. Yet, writing for popular instruction, he was always plain and perspicuous; his ideas being generally clothed in language, which the most learned might admire, and which the most ignorant could comprehend. If his diction possessed not always splendour, it nevertheless had chastity to recommend it. If it seldom displayed that richness of metaphor and glow of colouring, which is most suited to the taste  
of

of those who approve only adorned and luminous composition, it was nevertheless far from being destitute of grace ; it was neat without affectation, of ornament rather frugal than profuse, yet in every instance preserving an unostentatious decency and dignity peculiar to itself (<sup>14</sup>). Among the few distinguished writers therefore of his day, he should be considered as holding no contemptible rank ; and he lived in times, the taste of which was not inferior but far preferable to that of those, which succeeded them. The influx of Latin words, which soon after overwhelmed the English language, had then made but little progress ; nor had that absurd fondness become general for puerile refinements, for the constant recurrence of strained metaphors, and pedantic conceits, which disgraced the productions of a later period (<sup>15</sup>). Hence we are not at a loss to account for the superiority of style discoverable in our Liturgy, the masterly performance of Cranmer and his associates, which has always been admired, but seldom successfully imitated, and never equalled ; which is full without verbosity, fervid without enthusiasm, refined without the appearance of refinement, and solemn without the affectation of solemnity (<sup>16</sup>).

The reflexions perhaps, which have been made, may suffice to demonstrate that his literary character was not only far from being despicable, but of a stamp capable of giving respect to his sentiments, and weight to his decisions; while at the same time they may possibly contribute to prove, that, when his Creed varied, (a circumstance sometimes noticed invidiously,) the change was rather attributable to the vigour, than to the imbecillity of his intellect. His fate however has been peculiarly hard. Living in evil days, and exposed after his death to the malice of evil tongues, he has suffered in almost every part of his reputation. Papists have impeached the sincerity, while Protestants have doubted the steadiness of his principles; and a too general idea seems to prevail that his opinions were for ever fluctuating, or at least were so flexible, as to have rendered him little better than a weak instrument in the hands of those, who possessed more talent and more consistency. But the fact was far otherwise. He was in truth the chief promoter, and the ablest advocate of the Reformation, planning it with the discretion of a prudent and the zeal of a good man, and carrying it on towards perfection with a firmness, a wisdom, and a liberality, which  
obtained

obtained him no less credit for the endowments of his head, than for the impressions of his heart.

As little reason then is there to question his ability, as his personal influence, his personal influence, as his attachment to Lutheranism. The latter point seems beyond all controversy. During his mission into Germany upon the subject of Henry's divorce, when he began to acquire an ascendancy over the mind of that Monarch, which he never afterwards lost, he appears to have first received a favourable idea of the new doctrines, and to have proved his approbation of them by abandoning his clerical restriction of celibacy, and forming a connubial alliance with the near relative of a German Reformer. From this æra he became more and more attached to them; and as light was afforded him, according to his own observation, and in his own language, "through divine grace he "opened his eyes, and did not wilfully re- "pugn against God, and remain in dark- "ness (17)." Nor, if in one instance he at length departed from them, was his general predilection for them upon such account at all shaken. Yet ought it never to be forgotten, that truth alone was the object of his most ardent affections; and that he con-

C 4

ceived

ceived this most likely to be promoted by rational investigation. "For what harm," he remarked, "can gold catch in the fire, or "truth in discussion?" (18)

On the whole therefore the principles, upon which our Reformation was conducted, ought not to remain in doubt: they were manifestly Lutheran. With these the mind of him, to whom we are chiefly indebted for the salutary measure, was deeply impressed, and in conformity with them was our Liturgy drawn up, and the first book of our Homilies, all that were at the time composed.

That our Articles were in general founded upon the same principles, I shall in the next place endeavour to prove; after which I shall proceed to the several points proposed for elucidation.

Our first Reformers indeed, had they been so disposed, might have turned their attention to the novel establishment at Geneva, which Calvin had just succeeded in forming according to his wishes, might have imitated its singular institutions, and inculcated its peculiar doctrines: but this they declined, viewing it perhaps as a faint luminary, (for as such only could it then have been contemplated,) scarcely in the horizon of its celebrity (19). This they might have done; but they rather chose

chose to give reputation to their opinions, and stability to their system, by adopting, where reason permitted, Lutheran sentiments, and expressing themselves in Lutheran language. Yet slavishly attached to no particular tenets, although revering those, which were held universally sacred, and submissive to no man's dictates, they felt a conscious pride in reasoning for themselves; anxious only to prove all things according to that talent, which God had given them, by the test of truth, and the unerring standard of holy Scripture. The most distinguished of their number was the amiable and enlightened Prelate, to whom I have alluded. Under his guidance, our reformed Church had emerged from the clouds, which involved it in its earlier progress, and was rapidly advancing towards its meridian, when Papal superstition suddenly extinguished it in blood. But its extinction was not destined to be perpetual. Favoured by Providence, which has often proved liberal in blessings to this nation, it soon resumed the lustre of which it had been deprived; and grateful ought we to be, that after a lapse of centuries, in spite of Bigotry, Scepticism, and Infidelity, we still behold its influence undiminished, and its splendour unobscured.





---

## S E R M O N II.

JEREMIAH iii. 15.

*And I will give you pastors according to mine heart,  
which shall feed you with knowledge and understand-  
ing.*

ON a former occasion I endeavoured to prove, that the established doctrines of our Church, from the commencement of the Reformation to the period, when our Articles first appeared, were chiefly Lutheran: to point out, that the original plan was ultimately adhered to, and that in the composition of our national Creed a general conformity with the same principles was scrupulously preserved, will be the object of the present Lecture: after which I shall proceed to the more immediate topics proposed for investigation.

It is much to be regretted, that those, who have either professedly or incidentally written upon our Articles, have not bestowed that particular attention upon the history of their compilation, which the subject itself  
seems

seems to require; the scope of every attempt having rather been to discover, what construction peculiar expressions would admit, as applicable to the favourite controversies of a more recent period, than to determine their sense by ascertaining the sources from which they were primarily derived. In discussing therefore the question before me, I shall not perhaps appear too minute, when it is recollected, that it has been hitherto but imperfectly considered, writers of superior eminence having disregarded what they possibly deemed inferior speculations, and exercised their abilities in the prosecution of higher and according to common estimation more profitable researches.

Escaping from a captivity not unaptly termed the Babylonian (<sup>1</sup>), the Reformers of Germany had broken the Papal yoke asserted their religious independence, and framed for themselves a Creed, in contempt of the Pontiff's dictates, according to the rule of reason and the laws of God. When the bold philippics, the keen sarcasms, and the solid arguments of Luther, had gained him profelytes in almost every part of the Empire, when princes and peasants, the literate and illiterate, alike perceived the necessity of reform, and rejoiced at the opportunity

portunity of it, in a public Convention of the States assembled at Augsbourgh the Protestant party exhibited that admirable confession of their faith, which from the name of the place, where the Diet was convened, has since received its appropriate appellation. In imitation of this example, the Reformers of our own country, with piety at least equal, with talents not inferior, and with discretion perhaps in some respects greater, not only distributed to a starving multitude the food of knowledge and understanding for the short period of their own lives, but treasured up the manna of their doctrine in the ark of the Church for perpetual conservation.

It has often been asked, with whom did the plan of our Articles originate, and to whom ought their actual composition to be attributed? After the remarks, which have been already made, I may probably be anticipated in the observation, that they are to be ascribed to Cranmer, who was not only officially deputed to the task on account of his rank and situation, but eminently qualified for it by his character and abilities <sup>(2)</sup>. Indeed when interrogated on this very point by his relentless persecutors, not long before his death, he unequivocally avowed himself to have been the author of them <sup>(3)</sup>. It has  
never-

nevertheless been usually conceived, that he derived much assistance from Ridley, who, as far as the paucity of his writings enables us to judge, seems to have no less excelled in perspicuity than in solidity of argument, in manliness of conception, than in energy of expression. Latimer likewise has been considered as his coadjutor in the same undertaking. That each of these respectable Bishops was consulted on the occasion appears highly probable. Ridley, if an anecdote recorded of him be accurate, expressly stated, that he both perused the production before its publication, and noted many things for it; that he thus consented to it, but that he was not the author of it <sup>(4)</sup>. The venerable Latimer, who had resigned his bishopric in the reign of Henry, declining a reinstatement in it, then dwelt under the roof of the Archbishop, by whom, for his virtues and integrity, he was sincerely respected, and cordially beloved. To a Divine of this description so peculiarly circumstanced, it is impossible to suppose a design of such importance not to have been communicated, to one who had acquired the proud title of the Apostle of England <sup>(5)</sup>, who had long been the Primate's fellow-labourer in the work of reformation, and who was capable not only  
of

of improving it by his wisdom and experience, but of conferring upon it an old man's benediction. But although we allow this and even more than this; although we admit, that Cranmer held in the highest esteem the masculine mind of Ridley, and the plain but strong sense, as well as unshaken probity of Latimer; men, who bore able testimony to the truth while in prosperity, and in adversity sealed it with their blood; yet it appears not that, from any consciousness of personal inferiority, he ever beheld them with an obsequious eye. He indeed ought alone to be considered as the real and not ostensible author of the production; although collecting the sentiments of others, yet in all cases exercising the privilege of accepting or rejecting what may have been offered to him at pleasure, and regulating his decisions by a judgment, to which all with submission bowed, which, matured by the most extensive reading, and formed upon the purest principles, his adversaries respected and his friends revered.

In an undertaking of this nature his active mind seems to have been engaged almost immediately after the death of Henry. Although the prospect, which had shone so bright at one period of that Prince's reign,  
towards

towards the conclusion of it became almost lost in clouds and darkness, yet upon the accession of Edward, the horizon again cleared, and the same pleasing scene opened, even more distinctly, to the view. At this favourable juncture, while remodelling and re-christianizing the language and ceremonies of public worship, he turned his attention to the formation of some permanent system of faith, which might prevent the diversity of opinion, otherwise to be apprehended. For scarcely had the idol of Papal infallibility fallen to the ground, before every man began to make a God of his own conceit, and to deem himself infallible. The Arian derided the Enthusiast, and the Enthusiast detested the Arian; while the one extolled reason above Scripture, the other disregarded both, consulting only secret voices and internal revelations. Many remained wholly, and many only in part, addicted to ancient superstitions. The depravity of human nature had been explained away by the Papist; it was now believed to be completely ideal by the Anabaptist: the assistance of divine grace had in effect been deemed useless by the former; it was now totally denied by the latter, who supported his reasoning, (if reasoning it could be called,) not like the Papist by a plausible and bewildering

bewildering philosophy, but by the mere effrontery of unblushing assertion. Some of relaxed morals, without regard to sect or party, engrafted upon the doctrine of God's foreknowledge the most licentious principles, and most dissolute practice: others of stricter lives lost themselves in fruitless speculations upon the attributes and will of the unrevealed Godhead, worshipping they knew not what, and deifying the dark production of their own imagination. In order therefore to check discordance and promote unanimity of sentiment, and above all things to guard against the errors of the Church of Rome, which it was impossible to approve without hypocrisy, or even contemplate with indifference, it seemed important to establish an authoritative standard of public opinion. Something of this kind it was probably hoped might prevent the wavering Papist from taking disgust at the incongruous theories, which on every side presented themselves, and the half converted Protestant, wearied with expecting in vain the subsidence of that deluge of doctrines, which had inundated the Christian world, from returning to his wretched state of mental captivity. But upon the precise comprehension of the original plan at this remote period, and with such scanty

D

materials

materials of information, it is difficult to speak with certainty. Some circumstances however, which remain on record, seem to prove, that it was neither partial nor limited.

At the commencement of Edward's reign it appears that Melancthon was consulted upon this interesting subject (<sup>6</sup>). Melancthon was then alone at the head of the Lutherans, universally respected as the author of their much applauded Confession; a Reformer, whose accomplishments, temper, and talents were the admiration of all parties, and the peculiar pride of his own; a man precisely after Cranmer's own heart, indeed the only one in a turbulent age, who equalled if not exceeded that benevolent Prelate, in mildness of disposition, and in moderation of principle. Deeply impressed with the importance and necessity of the object in contemplation, he earnestly exhorted the Archbishop (whom he directly addressed on the occasion) to attempt an extension of the benefit beyond the confines of the English Church, to form a Creed adapted to the Protestant world at large, by collecting the sentiments of pious and learned men, and thus sanctioning with high authority that, which might exist among all nations as an illustrious testimony of the wisdom



wisdom of the Reformation, and become a rule of faith to posterity. The Confession, which he had himself formerly drawn up, would, he conceived, prove something of this description; but he wished, that a few particular points had been more explicitly stated, in order to prevent the probability of future altercation. Perspicuity above all things he recommended, anxious to have every ambiguous expression avoided, that new dissensions might not arise, nor the apple of discord be thrown among the lovers of religious controversy. If his own assistance should be requested, he subjoined, with a modesty, which characterized his feelings, and with a candour, which tinged all his opinions, that he was prepared both to hear the sentiments of other men, and to declare his own, willing, while he attempted to persuade, to be himself persuaded. But always, he added in conclusion, may the cause of truth, the glory of God, and the welfare of the Church prove victorious over every private affection and personal partiality.

The enlarged scheme of the liberal Melancthon was not, we may suppose, disregarded or even lightly esteemed in this country. A congress of the kind thus recommended Cranmer afterwards appears to have had in

D 2

view.

view. For although not immediately, (perhaps in consequence of the persecution, which the imperial measure, usually denominated the Interim, then began to threaten,) yet shortly after, he communicated the design to the Helvetian Reformers at Zurich and Geneva ('). Scarcely however was it imparted to them, before it was completely abandoned, and a resolution adopted of compiling a system of faith solely for the Church of England.

Relinquishing then the idea respecting a congress of foreign Divines, partly perhaps on account of the general perplexities of the times, and partly perhaps the obvious difficulties of the undertaking itself, he contracted his views, and began to frame a Creed solely for domestic purposes. But although a form of such a nature appears almost immediately to have been compiled, yet it was not until after a considerable lapse of time finally arranged and published by authority. Among other reasons, which may be assigned for this delay, is it not possible, that one might have been the hope of obtaining the valuable assistance of Melancthon, who was repeatedly invited, in Edward's as well as in Henry's reign, to fix his residence in this country? From the commencement  
indeed

indeed to the conclusion of it, he seems to have been almost continually expected in England: and while our Articles were preparing, while first their completion, and afterwards their publication, was deferred from day to day, the Theological Professorship in Cambridge was kept open apparently for the chance of his acceptance<sup>(8)</sup>. If it be too much to conjecture, that the delay was solely imputable to the wish of submitting them to his personal inspection, and of improving them by his consummate wisdom, the coincidence nevertheless of the time, during which they were postponed, with that of his much hoped for arrival here, cannot altogether escape observation. And when we recollect, that he had been particularly consulted at the original conception of them, and that an attempt had been made to carry his advice upon them into effect, we may surely be justified in asserting, that considerable importance must have been attached to his opinions.

But to whatsoever cause we may attribute their retardation, it is certain that they were two entire years in progress: after being, at first perhaps hastily, drawn up, they were immediately delivered to the respective Bishops of every diocese; in the next year they were revised

and augmented; and in the following received the sanction of royal authority (<sup>9</sup>). In what the augmentations consisted, were it merely as a point of curiosity, we naturally wish to discover; but we can flatter ourselves with little hope of finding a direct clue to guide us in our researches into the private transactions of a distant period, succeeded by one of an opposite description, which would have blotted out all traces, and, could it have been effected, all remembrance of what had recently passed. An indirect one however, which seems to have been overlooked, may be found in the writings of our Romish adversaries. Between the primary formation and subsequent revision of the new Creed, some refractory Divines in the diocese of Worcester maintained a controversy against it, which was afterwards published, and is still extant (<sup>10</sup>). Now if we compare the Articles contained in this publication with those, which appeared under authority, we seem accurately to gain the object of our pursuit. We thus perceive, that the additions to them in the last instance were numerous; that, neglecting slighter shades of difference, they were at first almost wholly limited to the more striking errors of Popery; and that some of the topics, which I propose to discuss,

cufs, exifted not in the original compofition<sup>(11)</sup>. One circumftance perhaps is deferving of particular notice. When reviewed and augmented, a paflage directly militating againft the Lutheran opinion of Consubftantiation was inferted; but, as if an anxiety had been demonftrated to preferve a conformity in other refpects, many of the augmentations upon points of doctrine at the fame time introduced were not only of a Lutheran tendency, but couched in the very expreffions of the Lutheran Creed.

Confidering them therefore even in their rude outline, but more particularly in their perfect ftate, we difcover, that, in various parts of their compofition, Cranmer ftudioufly kept in view that boaft of Germany and pride of the Reformation, the Confeflion of Augfbourgh. Prudent, cautious, and fteady in his attachments, fearful of extremes, and diftruffful of novelties, he principally turned his eye to that favourite quarter, from which the ray of truth had originally proceeded, and where it ftill fhone with undiminished luftre. But to defcend into a minute comparison of the two productions would lead me too far from my purpofe; it feems fufficient to notice the fact of a manifefit refemblance between them, which in fome in-

stances amounts to a direct transcript of whole passages, in others to the adoption only of leading sentiments and peculiar phraseology (<sup>12</sup>). And if upon one individual point a plain deviation occurs, it should be recollected, that this is one, of which the Author of the Augsbourg Confession was himself suspected.

Hitherto I have endeavoured to shew with what principles our Articles preserved a consonancy, as they were framed in the reign of Edward. It will be of importance in the next place to point out, that, from these, those, which were ratified by his successor, but slightly varied, and that, where any variation is to be found, it appears to have been taken from a similar source; a circumstance, which, if capable of proof, will strongly confirm the position, which I endeavour to establish.

When a permanent system of faith was settled by the Clergy assembled in convocation under Elizabeth, the See of Canterbury was filled by Archbishop Parker, who as an antiquarian and Saxon scholar still ranks high in the republic of letters (<sup>13</sup>). Nor as the restorer of our Church did he acquire a less solid, if less brilliant, reputation. Called by the providence of God to rebuild the walls  
of

of our Zion, rudely subverted by Papal bigotry, he neglected not the revered materials of the former fabric. After the revival of our Liturgy, his attention was directed to the consideration of speculative questions: and here the temperate proceedings of the Assembly, which discussed them, seemed perfectly to correspond with his most sanguine wishes. Instead of entering upon the task of innovation, instead of bringing forward a new code of doctrines, which some might have thought more adapted to the improved state of religious taste and sentiment, the Convocation was satisfied to tread in a beaten path; it not only made the articles of Cranmer the basis of the proposed system, but adopted them in general word for word. Of what was the intention in this respect no testimony can be more conclusive, than the evidence of the original document itself, which is still preserved with the signatures of the Clergy annexed to it, and which is nothing more than an interlined and amended copy of the formulary, which had been adopted in the preceding reign (<sup>14</sup>).

Whatsoever then might have been the dispositions of a few over zealous men, the members of this important convention displayed a remarkable proof of their moderation  
and

and judgment, by generally reviving what had been before established, rather than, in order to gratify the restless spirit of innovation, by inculcating novel doctrines. Instead of increasing the number of the Articles, they diminished them; instead of extending their sense, so as to make them embrace a greater proportion of speculative tenets, they contracted them, and appeared in every case more disposed to extinguish difference of opinion, than to augment it by adding fuel to a flame, already rising above controul. In one or two instances indeed additions, or rather additional elucidations, were admitted. Of the tendency however of these we cannot doubt, when we learn, that, with the exception of one obvious topic alone, they were not original; that they were neither the productions of Parker nor the Convocation; and that they were not borrowed from any Calvinistical or Zuinglian, but from a Lutheran Creed. The Creed to which I allude is the Confession of Wirtemberg, which was exhibited in the Council of Trent the very year, when our own Articles were completely arranged by Cranmer. That their resemblance to this composition should have been hitherto overlooked is the more remarkable, because it seems too visible, one  
would



would conceive, to have escaped the notice of the most superficial observer. For it was not confined to a mere affinity of idea, or the occasional adoption of an individual expression; but in some cases entire extracts were copied, without the slightest omission or minutest variation (<sup>15</sup>).

If then we duly weigh the facts, which have been stated, and the consequences, which seem to result from them, we shall not perhaps be at a loss to determine, from what quarter we are likely to collect the best materials for illustrating the Articles of our Church. We perceive, that in the first compilation many prominent passages were taken from the Augsbourg, and in the second from the Wirtembergh Confession; the latter not being considered as a retraction of the former, but rather, what only it professed to be, as a repetition and compendium of it (<sup>16</sup>). These were the Creeds of Lutherans. We have seen likewise that their sentiments were chiefly inculcated, and their example followed, in almost every preceding step of the Reformation. To the most approved writers therefore of this description I shall have recourse for information upon points no less connected with the opinions of their Church than our own, referring only to such productions,

ductions, as were composed before the death of Edward. Subsequent publications it will be useless to consult, because they could not have been in the contemplation of Cranmer, and were evidently neglected by his successors in reform, who chose to select the inconsiderable augmentations which they thought it requisite to make, not from any applauded work of the intermediate period, but from one of precisely the same date with the Articles previously framed by their illustrious Predecessor.

To the writings of Calvin it will be in vain to apply, as some have done, from any conception, that our Clergy in the last revision were eager to propagate the new principles, which they may be supposed to have imbibed during the sanguinary persecution under Mary. For, as if distrustful upon this head, the prudent Restorers of our Church, unless on an individual question, where the interests of truth forbade a compromise, kept the Creed of a different communion in view; the Creed likewise of an æra prior to that event, which, by compelling many of our proscribed countrymen to take refuge on the continent, particularly at Geneva, laid the foundation of a controversy respecting Discipline and the forms of Divine Worship, which long disturbed the tranquillity of our Ecclesi-

Ecclesiastical Establishment, often threatened its existence, and once actually subverted it. But to the name of Calvin, whose talents even prejudice must confess to have been not inferior to his piety, but whose love of hypothesis was perhaps superior to both, from the celebrity which it afterwards acquired, too much importance has been sometimes annexed. It has been forgotten, that at the time under contemplation, the errors of the Church of Rome were almost the sole objects of religious altercation, no public dissension of consequence having occurred among Protestants, although thinking variously on various topics, except upon the single point of the Eucharist; and that Calvin's system upon this had not obtained its full reputation, his controversies upon the subject not being then in existence; controversies, which first began to perpetuate his name, and to render Calvinism a characteristical appellation. Nor has it been sufficiently observed, that his title to fame on this occasion arose not so much from his opinions themselves, which differed but little, except in terms, from what had been before advanced by Bucer and other mediators between the two extremes of a corporal and a spiritual presence, as from the perspicuity, with which he explained,

plained, and the ability, with which he defended them, when attacked by the Lutherans, who had not yet entered the field of combat against him (17). But no more convincing evidence, perhaps, can be alleged, that the incense of flattery, which was afterwards abundantly offered up, had not then been received, than the total silence respecting him preserved by a contemporary writer, who seemed pertinaciously attached to all his opinions; I mean the well known author of an Ecclesiastical History, containing the acts and monuments of Martyrs. From the voluminous production alluded to, it appears not that any of those, who suffered in the reign of Mary, were accused of having adopted the sentiments of Calvin, but either of Luther or of Zuingli; nor does the prolix Historian himself, while he dwells in detail upon the writings and merits of both the latter, distinguish the name, or attempt to immortalize the memory, of the former.

It was indeed more to his theory of Predestination, than to that of the Sacramental Presence, that in process of time he was indebted for his renown. Even this however at the period under review had not passed the controversial flame, from which, in the estimation of his zealous adherents, it came forth with

with additional brilliancy and purity. It was not then, as afterwards, the object of applause, but, on the contrary, of disapprobation (<sup>18</sup>). For his doctrine of *God's dreadful decree*, which before had attracted little notice, was then beginning to give offence both within and without the territory of Geneva. *Dreadful* I term it, as being no less so to his feelings, than to ours; for the same strong epithet he himself applied to it. "Horribile quidem decretum fateor," were the precise expressions which he used, when shuddering at his own favourite idea of irrelative reprobation (<sup>19</sup>).

To the labours therefore of the Lutherans I shall turn in preference (<sup>20</sup>). But, before I enter upon the task, it seems necessary to state, that some discrimination will be exercised; that, rejecting such opinions as they themselves abandoned about the æra of the diet of Augsbourg, I shall bring forward only those, which were subsequently established in their stead.

For it ought not to be concealed, that previously to the time when Lutheranism first became settled upon a permanent basis, and added public esteem to public notice, tenets were advanced, which retarded the progress of truth more than all the subtleties  
of

of scholastical argument, or the terrors of Papal anathema. At the beginning of the Reformation, as Melancthon frankly observed to Cranmer in a correspondence already alluded to, there existed among its advocates stoical disputations respecting fate, offensive in their nature, and noxious in their tendency (<sup>21</sup>). The duration however of these stoical disputations, it should be remarked, was but short; and the substitution of a more rational as well as practical system, for the space of more than twenty years before the appearance of our Articles, prevented the Founder of our Church from mistaking for the doctrines of the Lutherans those, which they themselves wished to forget, and were anxious to obliterate.

The Articles which I shall discuss, or rather the doctrine of which, as connected with the controversies of the time, I shall endeavour to develop, are those upon Original Sin, upon Works before Grace, and Free Will as allied to the same, upon Justification by faith alone, and lastly upon Predestination and Election. And since on all these topics, on some in part only, but on most of them wholly, the German Reformers were at issue with the Church of Rome, from the compositions of Luther and Melancthon on one side, and from those of the School Divines on the other,

other, the observations, which I shall have to make, will be principally selected. It may then, perhaps, appear, as well from internal as external evidence, whence Cranmer derived the principles of our national Creed, and according to what system they should be interpreted. It may appear, that from the Lutherans, who had been his masters in Theology, he had learned (one point only excepted) almost every thing, which he deemed great and good in reformation; and that with them he was desirous of preserving not a servile, but a liberal conformity, while turning from the disgustful sophistry of the times, and embracing Gospel simplicity, he fed the flock of Christ committed to his charge with the bread of knowledge and understanding, unmixed with Popish leaven, with that preposterous doctrine of merits, which was at once a reproach to human reason, and a disgrace to Christianity.





---

## S E R M O N III.

ROMANS V. 19.

*By one Man's disobedience many were made Sinners.*

IN the preceding Lectures I have endeavoured to point out the source, from which our Articles were derived, and to prove, that no alterations, however trivial, (at least none which relate to the subject before me,) were admitted after their original publication, unless such, as were borrowed from a similar source, and a composition coæval with them; circumstances, which necessarily limit my proposed enquiry, the former confining it generally to a single object, the latter always to a single period. Instead therefore of attempting to illustrate them by the predominant opinions either of Elizabeth's or any succeeding reign, it seems more correct to compare them with those which prevailed when they were first promulgated.

Avoiding therefore every question not at the time agitated, I shall attend only to the pecu-

liar controversies of the day ; to controversies, which were carried on by the Lutherans against the Papists, and which our own Reformers appear to have had in view, when, separating from the Church of Rome, they established a new Creed, not in order to erect a barrier between Protestant and Protestant, but principally to raise a broad and secure boundary against the return of Romish error. All subsequent points of difference, by whatsoever party introduced, and to whatsoever object directed, it seems better to omit, than to confuse the enquiry by the discussion of irrelevant topics, and the application of incongruous theories.

As we descend to particulars, it will be necessary to keep our eye upon one prominent doctrine, which was eminently conspicuous in all the controversies of the Lutherans ; the doctrine of complete Redemption by Christ, which in their idea their adversaries disregarded, who denied in effect the depravity of our nature, believed the favour of Heaven in this life recoverable by what was denominated Merit of Congruity, and in the life to come by that, which was termed Merit of Condignity, and founded Predestination upon merits of such a description ; thus in every instance, while retaining the name of  
Christians,

Christians, rendering Christianity itself superfluous. In opposition to opinions so repugnant in many respects to reason, and in almost all so subversive of Scripture, the Lutherans constantly pressed the unsophisticated tenet of the Atonement, not contractedly in a Calvinistical, but comprehensively in a Christian point of view, in one, in which both Calvinists and Arminians alike embrace it. This therefore will be found more or less to pervade every topic, which I propose to examine, in most cases to give it its true, and in some its only direction (<sup>1</sup>).

The subject, which comes first in order to be considered, is that, which is contained in the Article of Original Sin.

When reformation began to appeal from the fallible judgment of man to the infallible Word of God, an abstruse system of Divinity prevailed, cultivated with enthusiasm by many, and respected by all, which was grounded upon the minute distinctions and subtle deductions of the Schoolmen, whose empire was no less universal in Theology than in Science. Aiming rather to perplex than convince, to amuse than instruct, those metaphysical reasoners were equally distinguished by the boldness as by the futility of their researches. Vain of a talent, which

they conceived adequate to every species of investigation, they believed nothing in created or uncreated being to be above their comprehension ; they laboured even to scrutinize the perfections of Him, who dwells in light inaccessible. No wonder then that, thus ambitious, they should think themselves competent to delineate man both in his primæval and fallen state ; proudly to dogmatize upon the faculties of the creature, when they affected with precision to philosophize upon the nature of the Creator.

But although a more rational as well as more practical system has long superseded their once applauded but now forgotten labours, we ought not to withhold from them merit of every kind, esteeming their mental powers scarcely above contempt. If in their voluminous productions little elegance is to be found, and much perhaps of what is usually termed barbarism, yet even prejudice must confess, that they were gifted with a wonderful facility in exploring the most intricate labyrinths of metaphysical disquisition. And, although it cannot be denied, that they consumed the greatest portion of their time in frivolous dissertations, it is nevertheless impossible not to allow them considerable ability, how ill soever it was directed, and not  
to

to regret, that so much sagacity and perseverance were generally wasted upon useless objects. Amidst the thorns, with which their compositions are abundantly surrounded, no vulgar display of argument may sometimes be discerned ; but, the modern Student in Theology seldom thinks, that the toil of the search is repaid by the value of the discovery. In the Church of Rome, however, they have always ranked high ; for principally to the aid of their sophisms was that Church indebted for the absolute dominion, which she acquired over the consciences of her devotees ; their acute and penetrating Logic was the flaming sword, which turned on every side to guard the Papal Paradise.

Previously to the Reformation, whatsoever discredit may have since attached to them, they were deemed all but infallible. Hence Luther, who justly imputed much of the corruption, which had overspread Christianity, to the blind admiration with which their writings were every where regarded, perpetually attacked and exposed their fallacies, persuaded, that, in the same proportion as he depressed their reputation, he exalted the word of God above the perverted wisdom of vain man, restoring simplicity to Truth, rectitude to Reason, and purity to Religion <sup>(2)</sup>.

Upon Original Sin, the subject of our present consideration, their doctrine was no less fanciful, and remote from every Scriptural idea, than flattering to human pride. This they assumed as the groundwork of a system, which wholly concealed from view what they professed to enshrine, the Glory of the Lord, the bright manifestation of Deity displayed in the Gospel Covenant. They contended, that the infection of our nature is not a mental, but a mere corporeal taint; that the body alone receives and transmits the contagion, while the soul in all instances proceeds immaculate from the hands of her Creator. This disposition to disease, such as they allowed it to be, was considered by some of them as the effect of a peculiar quality in the forbidden fruit; by others, as having been contracted from the poisonous breath of the infernal Spirit, which inhabited the serpent's body (<sup>3</sup>). On one point they were all united; by preserving to the soul the bright traces of her divine origin unimpaired, they founded on a deceitful basis an arrogant creed, which, in declaring peace and pardon to the sinner, rested more upon personal merit, than the satisfaction of a Saviour.

In commenting upon the celebrated Book of Sentences, a work once regarded as a stupendous

pendous effort of human ingenuity, and an invaluable production of rational piety, more studied and not much less revered than the sacred Scriptures themselves, the disciples of Lombard never failed to improve every hint, which tended to degrade the grace of God, and exalt the pride of man. Interweaving with the uncultivated speculations of their master the refined conceits of a fond philosophy, they flattered themselves, that they were forming a wreath for his brow, which no future age could tear away. Yet while with more than his confidence and precision they affected on every occasion to define the powers and capacities of man, sometimes apparently at variance with him, and often professedly with each other, they proceeded from disquisition to disquisition, and from distinction to distinction, until they seemed lost in a wilderness of investigation. Nor unfrequently were arguments advanced and conclusions adopted in order to gratify the vanity of human reason, which reason itself, had it not been infatuated, while it smiled, would have blushed to contemplate.

But, if these writers, who perverted the divinity as well as literature of the ages in which they lived, maintained, that the body alone and not the soul became vitiated by the fall,  
in

in what, it may be asked, did they suppose the guilt of Original Sin to consist, and what to be the necessity of remitting it? The answer to this question will be found to contain the principal scope of the controversy. Original Sin they directly opposed to original Righteousness; and this they considered not as something connatural with man, but as a superinduced habit or adventitious ornament, the removal of which, according to the philosophical principles of the Stagirite, could not prove detrimental to the native powers of his mind. Hence they stated the former simply to be the loss or want of the latter; of an accomplishment unessential to his nature, of which it might be deprived, yet still retain its integrity inviolate<sup>(4)</sup>. When therefore they contemplated the effects of the fall, by confining the evil to a corporeal taint, and not extending it to the nobler faculties of the soul, they regarded man as an object of divine displeasure, not because he possessed that, which was offensive, but because he was defective in that, which was pleasing to the Almighty. While, however, they laboured to diminish the effects, they augmented in equal proportion the responsibility of the first transgression, asserting, that all participated in the guilt of Adam. He, they said, re-  
ceived



ceived for himself and his posterity the gift of righteousness, which he subsequently forfeited; in his loins we were included, and by him were virtually represented: his will was ours, and hence the consequence of his lapse is justly imputable to us his descendants<sup>(5)</sup>. By our natural birth therefore, under this idea, we are alienated from God, innocent in our individual persons, but guilty in that of him, from whom we derived our existence; a guilt, which, although contracted through the fault of another, yet so closely adheres to us, that it effectually precludes our entrance at the gate of everlasting life, until the reception of a new birth in baptism.

Thus they contended that the lapse of Adam conveys to us solely imputed guilt, the corporeal infection, which they admitted, not being Sin itself, but only the subject-matter of it, not *peccatum*, but, according to their phraseology, *fomes peccati*, a kind of fuel, which the human will kindles or not at pleasure<sup>(6)</sup>. It required, however, no common talent at paradoxical solution to prove, what was pertinaciously held, the innocence of that occult quality, which disposes to crime without being itself criminal, which, void of all depravity, renders the mind depraved; that

that metaphorical fuel of the affections, which, although not vicious in its own nature, yet, when inflamed, generates vice in the heart, upon which it preys.

Such was the outline of the doctrine upon this point maintained in the Church of Rome, which was always discussed with much metaphysical detail and many abstract distinctions. The tenet of the Lutherans, on the other hand, when neither ignorantly misconceived, nor wilfully misrepresented, is remarkable for its simplicity and perspicuity, is congenial with every man's feelings, and divested of all subtleties within the scope of popular comprehension. If its object is sometimes mistaken, we cannot be surprised at the circumstance, when we recollect to what it was opposed ; to scholastical speculations, which appear to the modern eye the deepest gloom of night, so that it necessarily becomes less distinct by being intermingled with darkness. Equally, however, averse from the fastidious philosophy and fanciful theories of their opponents, they wished rather to prove instructive than amusing, to propagate Scriptural truth than metaphysical refinements, and to exalt the glory of God than the credit of their own abilities.

Avoiding all intricate questions upon the  
subject,

subject, they taught, that Original Sin is a corruption of our nature in a general sense, a depravation of the mental faculties and the corporeal appetites ; that the resplendent image of the Deity, which man received at the creation of the world, although not annihilated, is nevertheless greatly impaired ; and that in consequence the bright characters of unspotted sanctity, once deeply engraven on his mind by the hand of the living God, are become obliterated, the injury extending to his intellect, and affecting as well his reason and his will, as his affections and passions. When therefore they contended, as frequently they did, that our nature is corrupted, they contrasted the position with the scholastical doctrine of its integrity : and when they urged its total corruption, they opposed the idea of a deterioration in one part only, and even that consisting of a propensity void of sin. To conceive that inclination to evil incurs not in itself the disapprobation of Heaven, appeared to them little better than an apology for crime ; or at least a dangerous palliation of that, which the Christian's duty compels him not only to repress, but abhor (?).

Yet while they argued, that in consequence of this depravity we are to be considered by  
our

our natural birth as the children of wrath, they admitted, that by our new birth in baptism we all are made the children of grace. When, however, on this occasion they pressed the necessity of complying with a Gospel institution, we must not suppose them to have understood that expression in its strongest sense, as excluding from every hope of mercy those, whom involuntary accident or incapacity has prevented from participating in the Christian Covenant.

For arguments are not wanting to prove, that, although they were anxious to select language, which could not be misrepresented, as insinuating with the Anabaptists the inutility of Infant baptism, they nevertheless subscribed not in this respect to the more contracted doctrine of their adversaries. Luther expressed himself upon this subject so clearly and explicitly, that we ought neither to doubt his creed, nor withhold the tribute justly due to the humanity of his feelings, and the liberality of his sentiments. Although infants, he remarked, bring into the world with them the depravity of their origin, yet is it an important consideration, that they have never transgressed the divine commandments; and since God is merciful, he will not, we may be assured, suffer them to fare the worse,

worse, because, without their own fault, they have been deprived of his holy baptism. The known rule, he likewise added, of extending favours and restraining rigours, may in this case be applied greatly to the glory of a Being, disposed by nature to pardon and pity, so that we must not conceive Him to be too severe against the children of Christians, who wills the salvation of all mankind <sup>(8)</sup>.

But whatsoever we may conceive the Lutherans to have maintained respecting the necessity of this sacred rite, it is certain, that upon the effects of it they widely differed from the Church of Rome. For while their opponents taught that Original Sin was totally obliterated in the laver of regeneration, they on the other hand asserted, that the corruption of our nature continues not only from the cradle to the font, but from the font to the grave, the same disposition, which exists before baptism, remaining after it <sup>(9)</sup>.

Upon the whole, their adversaries rested much upon the following philosophical truths; that we ought not to be esteemed virtuous or vicious, worthy of praise or censure, merely on account of involuntary passions; that all sin is determinable by the act of the will; and that human nature is not evil. This they readily admitted in its proper place;  
when

when applied to a fuitable object, and brought before a fuitable tribunal, the doctrine of morals and the judgment of mankind: but they reprobated the attempt of introducing it in order to superſede Chriſtianity, and to prove from it the purity of man in the eſtimation of God; of him, “in whoſe ſight the  
“very heavens are not clean, and who charg-  
“eth his angels with folly (10).” If therefore they dwelt much upon the dark ſide of the queſtion, it was no more than the occaſion demanded; the bright ſide of it had been long held up by the Church of Rome in ſo fallacious a point of view, that it ſeemed almoſt impoſſible to err in that reſpect.

The application of what has been obſerved, to the Article of our Church upon the ſame ſubject, has been already perhaps anticipated. Original Sin is there defined to be “the  
“fault and corruption of the nature of every  
“man, that naturally is engendered of the off-  
“ſpring of Adam (11), whereby man is far  
“gone from original righteouſneſs, and is  
“of his own nature inclined to evil, ſo that  
“the fleſh luſteth always contrary to the  
“ſpirit, and therefore, in every perſon born  
“into this world, it deſerveth God’s wrath  
“and damnation.” When we recollect the peculiar theory of the Scholaſtics, we imme-  
diately

diately perceive with what this definition was intended to be contrasted. According to their statement, Original Sin is nothing more than a defect of Original Righteousness, which, instead of being a connatural quality, was itself only a supernatural ornament, unessential to the soul. In opposition, therefore, to such a conceit, our Church represents it to be the fault and corruption of every man's *nature*, not the loss of a superadded grace, but the vitiation of his innate powers; a vitiation, by which he is very far removed from original righteousness, and by which, she subjoins, again repeating the word before used as distinctly expressive of her meaning, he is inclined to evil *of his own nature*; so that his passions continually resist the control of his reason. Yet while she esteems it not, as her adversaries held, an innocuous propensity, she does not declare it to be punishable as a crime; but steering a middle course, with a moderation, for which she is always remarkable, asserts it only to be *deserving* of God's displeasure. After the preceding definition, to which none but the Sophists of the schools could object, she proceeds to observe, in perfect conformity with common sense and with the doctrine of the Lutherans, that this depravation of nature re-

mains after baptism, so that concupiscence, or whatsoever else may be meant by the *φρόνημα σαρκὸς* of St. Paul, is not, as the Council of Trent had then recently maintained it<sup>(12)</sup>, and as the Church of Rome had always believed it to be, a sinless inclination; but one rebelling against the Law of God; and which, according to the Apostle, who nevertheless admits that there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, retains in itself the nature of Sin.

Having thus taken a survey of the Article, if a brief one, yet one perhaps, after the remarks which have been previously made, sufficiently full for its illustration, before I conclude, it may be necessary to state, that, although every expression in it seems studiously chosen to avoid the appearance of running into extremes, interpretations of this kind have notwithstanding been adopted. It has been supposed collaterally to hint the approbation of an opinion, which in all probability never entered the minds of our Reformers; to insinuate the general imputation of Adam's guilt to his posterity as the basis of the Calvinistical Predestination. But in truth, how attentively soever the Article be examined, not even the most distant allusion to an imputation of this kind is in any sense to  
be



be discovered ; and it is singular that in such a light neither Papist nor Protestant had ever yet contemplated it, the former, with whom it originated, maintaining it upon a different principle, and beholding it in a different point of view. One fact at least seems beyond controversy, and one, which many may think decisive of the question. It is certain that Calvin himself never directly taught it (<sup>13</sup>) ; but that at a period long after his death, his more correct followers formally introduced it, in order to supply, what they imagined to be, a striking deficiency in their system.

The other instance alluded to respects the fate of infants dying without baptism, whom some have conceived that our Church excludes from salvation. But that the very reverse of this is the fact, appears highly probable from a passage in the Article itself ; in which it is said, as I before observed, not that the corruption of our nature produces actual condemnation, but that merely it is *deserving* of it ; a distinction apparently intended to be marked with precision.

On so interesting a topic, however, we naturally wish for more information and greater certainty. If the sentiments then of Cranmer are to be deemed of importance,

they may be ascertained from a treatise upon the reformation of Ecclesiastical laws, which was composed under his superintendency, and probably with much of his individual assistance. In this work the scrupulous superstition of those is expressly condemned as impious, who so completely tie down the grace of God and the holy Spirit to the sacramental elements, as explicitly to affirm, that no infant can obtain eternal salvation, who dies before baptism: an opinion, it is said, far different from ours (<sup>14</sup>).

But more direct proof than this may be adduced, and proof which may, perhaps, be deemed conclusive. At the commencement of our baptismal service the Minister prays, that the child to be baptized may be received into the ark of Christ's Church; to which, as the form originally stood, it was added, "and so saved from perishing;" expressions too unequivocal to be misconceived. But when our Liturgy was in the first instance revised and corrected, which, it should be noticed, was immediately before the appearance of our Articles, this offensive passage was entirely omitted; an omission certainly not made without reason, nor adopted without design (<sup>15</sup>).

Indeed had our Reformers on this occasion

sion deliberately patronized the tenet, which some attribute to them, they would have directly incurred, what it is supposed they wished to avoid, the charge of singularity. No doubt can exist that Luther disapproved it. Calvin likewise was far from admitting it in an unqualified sense, hesitating to avow the distinction which his theory required <sup>(16)</sup>; while the Zuinglians unreservedly opposed it in the most manly way, maintaining, upon their favourite principle of Universal Redemption, that all infants without exception, whether baptized, or unbaptized, are saved through God's gracious promise, and in virtue of his Covenant, by the expiation which Christ made upon the cross for the whole race of mankind; an expiation only capable of being rendered void in its effects by wilful perversity and conscious crime <sup>(17)</sup>.

To conclude, from a retrospective view of what has been advanced, it appears, that the Reformers of this country, like their predecessors in Germany, solely wished to establish the doctrine of a mental degeneracy, which the Church of Rome denied. Against the subtleties of the Schools both entertained an equal, and avowed an open, hostility. Impressed with a due sense of human frailty, and instructed by the unerring page of Revelation,

tion, they rejected with contempt the dreams of Sophists; and on the other hand inculcated a creed, which was more popular because less abstruse, and which, appealing to the affections, seemed to be no less founded on the general experience of mankind, than on the common basis of Scripture and Reason.

They encountered not the formidable logic of the Schools from any principle of vain glory, to display their eloquence or ability; nor did they represent human nature as corrupted, by way of furnishing a pretext for criminal indulgencies, (for all were good men, and some in this country proved their sincerity by sacrificing life to conscience); but weary of scholastical trifling, and zealous for the propagation of revealed truth, they endeavoured to produce in the minds of others the same conviction which they felt in their own. Avoiding one extreme, they meant not to rush into another; and whatsoever use ignorant or enthusiastical men may have since made of any strong expressions, which they adopted, offensive only when misapplied, they never intended so to degrade our nature, as if it were lost to every sense of moral excellence<sup>(18)</sup>; they were alone desirous of reducing its proud pretensions

sions to the unadulterated standard of holy Scripture, to demonstrate, that the Christian redemption is not useless, nor grace promised us in vain (<sup>19</sup>). Neither were their efforts unavailing. In proportion as the sacred Writings, to which they constantly referred, became more read and better understood, the credit of the theological dictators of preceding ages was gradually diminished, until at length the fairy visions and phantastical speculations, with which a credulous world had been long amused, vanished before the splendour of Gospel day. So puerile indeed were some of these eccentric writers in their glosses upon the fall of man, and the transmission of its effects, that the Church of Rome herself began to grow ashamed of such folly ; and to slight in one respect at least the authority of those, who had been her instructors for centuries. From the general disrepute, however, which has since attached to scholastical theories among Protestants, a manifest inconvenience has arisen ; much misapprehension respecting the opinions, which were opposed to them, has sometimes unavoidably taken place in the mind of the modern controversialist, who averting his eye from them, and directing it to another quarter, has often lost sight of the only object,

upon which it should have been constantly fixed. Of the justice of this remark we shall be further convinced as we proceed in the enquiry, through the whole of which we shall almost always find it necessary to keep in view the dogmas of the Scholastics, of those once applauded reasoners, who supported with the acuteness of men the reveries of children, who laboured to perplex with subtleties the plainest and most simple truths, and who never were more pleased, than when entangling common sense in the web of their sophistry, or fanning into flame the secret spark of human pride.

---

## S E R M O N IV.

ACTS x. 4.

*Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial  
before God.*

THE case of Cornelius, whose prayers and alms are here said to have ascended up for a memorial before God, was often quoted by the advocates of the Church of Rome, to prove the merit of works before the reception of grace; to prove the human will capable, by its own inherent rectitude, of deserving the favour and approbation of Heaven. The Lutherans, on the other hand, contended, that the argument supported not the conclusion drawn from it; and was therefore irrelevant; that the works of Cornelius were not the causes but the effects of grace; and that this is sufficiently apparent from the context, in which he is described as a devout man, who feared God, and prayed continually (').

In allusion to the general question upon this subject, our Church asserts, that man is  
incapable

incapable of turning and preparing himself to true faith and invocation by his own unassisted efforts, of performing acceptable works without preventing and cooperating grace ; that such as precede justification are neither pleasing to the Almighty, nor meritorious of his favours, by what the School Divines termed Congruity ; and that not being done as God has willed and commanded them to be done, they are to be considered as participating of the nature of sin. But what these works before justification properly are, what is signified by the expression Congruity, and even the appellation Sinful, by which they are characterized, evident, as its sense may be supposed to appear, or with what particular view the insufficiency of our natural powers is so repeatedly urged, we shall in vain seek to discover by consulting modern controversies. In later times one object alone seems to have been contemplated, when the topic has been discussed respecting the efficacy or inefficacy of mere human ability in the production of good ; the application of such a principle to the doctrine of Predestination. To this has every argument and almost every expression been directed. I should, however, premise, that with this, in the instance under consideration, it is not properly connected ;



as it solely tends to establish the importance of Christian aid, and the necessity of Christian redemption.

On the present occasion I shall endeavour to deduce from its origin so much of the doctrine contained in our Articles upon Free Will and Works before Justification, (both embracing but one object,) as may be necessary to illustrate them; the illustration itself I shall defer to the succeeding Lecture.

When we turn our eye towards the distant æra of which I am treating, we perceive, that the Calvinistical cloud, which arose in the reign of Elizabeth, so long obscured the genuine tenets of the Reformation, that it is not easy to distinguish them through the almost impenetrable darkness, in which they have been involved. Yet this perhaps appears least to have been the case of the subject under review, one, which was controverted between the Lutherans and their opponents in the Church of Rome, with much inflexibility on both sides, not only before the reputation of Calvin became extended, but even before his name was known in the world. For so obvious a reason, therefore, if no other could be assigned, it would surely be proper principally to consult the writings of the Lutherans, when investigating the  
tendency

tendency of opinions, and the force of expressions, evidently derived from Lutheran sources.

But to explain the leading points of this once interesting, although now obsolete controversy, it will be requisite in some degree to explore the perplexed mazes of scholastical disquisition. The clew, however, which the volumes of Luther afford on the occasion, renders the attempt less bewildering, as we are not left to wander unguided from labyrinth to labyrinth, but solely to follow where he conducts us. Nor will it be requisite, in developing the ancient sophistry of the Schools, to regard in any way the glosses of modern Commentators; it will only be important to determine, in what view he contemplated it, and what were the more obnoxious, as well as prominent parts of it in his conception.

The question, therefore, to be investigated, was evidently scholastical, in the discussion of which, although the disputatious advocates of the Schools seemed not always to agree among themselves, and even sometimes to disagree respecting terms and modes of expression, yet until the period of the Reformation nothing like a serious opposition to it existed; until then the flame of controversy,  
which

which encircled the metaphysical system, played harmless around it, and, instead of consuming, only served to adorn it.

The disciples of Lombard, how variously soever distinguished by sects and parties, in whatsoever mode disposed to pervert reason, and annihilate Scripture, universally held, that neither before nor after the fall was man in himself capable of meriting heaven ; that by the gratuitous endowments of his creation, even in Paradise, he was only enabled to preserve his innocence, and not to sin ; and that he was utterly incompetent to proceed one step further, efficaciously to will a remunerable good, and by his natural exertions to obtain a reward above his nature, original righteousness being reputed not a connate quality, but a supernatural habit (<sup>2</sup>). Thus he could resist evil, but not advance good to perfection, could in some sense live well, by living free from sin ; but could not, without divine aid, so live as to deserve everlasting life. For such a purpose, they asserted, that grace was necessary, to operate upon his will in its primary determinations, and to cooperate with it in its ultimate acts. It was therefore in the loss of this celestial aid, this superadded gift, and not in any depravity of his mind, that they supposed the  
princi-

principal evil derivable from his lapse to consist; a loss however, which, by a due exertion of his innate abilities, they deemed to be retrievable; and hence sprung that offensive doctrine of human sufficiency, which, in the Lutheran's eye, completely obscured the glory of the Gospel, and which, when applied to the sinner's conscience, taught the haughty to presume, and the humble to despair.

According then to the system under consideration, the favour of God in this life, and his beatific presence in the life to come, are both attainable by personal merit; the former by congruous, as it was termed, the latter by condign; the one without, the other with the assistance of grace. By our natural strength, it was said, we can fulfil the commandments of God, as far as their obligation extends; yet was it added, that we cannot fulfil them according to the intention of the Divine Legislator: an intention of rewarding only those, who obey them in virtue, formed by charity, under the influence of a quality, rather regulating the tendency, than augmenting the purity, of the action <sup>(3)</sup>.

But although the blessing of eternal felicity be beyond our reach, yet is the only requisite, which we want to secure that blessing, within it: although we cannot, they said,

said, merit heaven itself without works of condignity, yet can we merit the means of obtaining it by works of congruity. Considering, therefore, the latter as introductory to the former, they stated, that we may so prepare ourselves for grace, as to become entitled to it congruously, not as to a debt, which, in strict justice, God is bound to pay, but as to a grant, which it is congruous in him to give, and which it would be inconsistent with his attributes to withhold (\*). In a higher or lower sense, in proportion as Christianity was left at a distance more or less remote, was this favourite doctrine supported by every denomination of Scholastics, and by every individual of the Church of Rome. Congruous merit was universally esteemed a pearl above all price, the intrinsic value of which attracted the regard, and conciliated the benevolence of the Almighty.

Arrogantly, however, as it was characterized, they nevertheless esteemed it not to be in every point completely good ; at least, not so sublimely good, as to demand a celestial recompense : yet did they not impute its deficiency in this respect to a degeneracy in the human faculties. For without grace, even before his lapse, man was believed to have been equally incompetent ; after it,  
then,

then, could he possibly be supposed to possess by nature a perfection, of which he had not to boast even while innocent? Although preparatory works, therefore, were represented as meritorious only in a certain degree, and in a peculiar sense, as holding a kind of middle state between absolute merit and actual demerit (<sup>s</sup>), yet ought it to be observed, that when we were stated, by the sole exertion of our natural powers, to be capable of not transgressing the laws of God, not to sin, more was comprehended in the expression than meets the ear. It was not merely hinted, that we can remove ourselves a degree above real crime, and attain a species of negative holiness, but that we can with sincerity fulfil our obligations both to God and man, and cultivate, without divine aid, the lovely train of moral virtues and pious affections.

For, according to their conception, we are endowed with an innate propensity to good, which vice itself can never obliterate, and are able not only to reverence and adore the Supreme Being, but to love him above other objects. In this way they argued, that man's attachment to terrestrial good, such as his eager desire of wealth, in the pursuit of which he exposes himself to ten thousand dangers,

dangers, and the indissoluble union of heart between the sexes, which disregards every consequence, and despises all control, surmounts the most formidable difficulties, and braves in its gratification even death itself, incontestibly proves his power of loving God above all things : for if in so great a degree he can esteem the inferior, how much more, they said, can he devote himself to the superior good, how much more idolize the Creator than the creature (<sup>6</sup>). After such a mode of reasoning it was, that they pronounced him to be furnished with the purest feelings, and adequate to the sublimest acts of devotion. Nor was this the only brilliancy in their finished portrait : for they supposed him competent no less to the efficient practice, than the barren admiration, of holiness ; enabled as well to obey the laws, as to love the goodness, of the Almighty ; and, if not to deserve the rewards, at least to discharge the obligations, of religion.

Impressed therefore with such exalted notions of human ability, and forgetful of the Christian propitiation for sin, the Sophists of the Schools maintained, that the soul of man possesses in the freedom, or rather the capacity, of her will a faculty almost divine. Stimulated by the most upright propensities,

and undepraved in her noblest powers, she directs her progress in the path of truth and the road to bliss, by the pure and inextinguishable light of an unpervverted reason (?). Although mutable in her decisions, nevertheless complete controller of her conduct, she becomes at pleasure either the servant of righteousness, or the slave of sin; and disdaining to be anticipated by God himself, prevents him in his supernatural gifts by a previous display of her own meritorious deeds, challenging, as a congruous right, that which only could have been otherwise conferred as a favour undeserved. Approaching the throne of mercy, not with a conscious sense of frailty, but with a confident persuasion of her inherent dignity, she wrests from a somnivolent Deity, hitherto but a slumbering spectator of her efforts, an ornamental grace, enabling her to merit that reward by condignity, which, without any defect of virtue, but merely by the appointed order of things, she is incapable of meriting by congruity.

Yet high as the pretensions of this latter merit were exalted above all evangelical considerations, the partisans of the Church of Rome, in their practical application of it, often stated it to consist as well in mere outward sanctity, as in an inward principle of  
the



the mind. If, said they, he, who continues polluted by mortal crime, performs any external act of devotion, with only a good natural intention, before his life is reformed, or his heart converted, he merits congruously, as the Scholastics phrased it, “*ex opere operato.*” But the infatuation rested not here. “By the bare observance of my holy order,” exclaimed the secluded devotee, “I am able not solely to obtain grace for myself, but by the works, which I then may do, can accumulate merit, sufficient both to supply my own wants and those of others, so that I may sell the superabundance of my acquired treasure.”<sup>(8)</sup> Can we be surprised that a Reformer of Luther’s manly disposition, who wrote without reserve, and reasoned without control; when adverting to opinions of so noxious a tendency, should sometimes, from excess of zeal, lose sight of moderation in his censures?

Having thus traced the outline of the scholastical tenet upon this subject, I proceed to consider that, which was supported on the other side by the Lutherans. Engaging in a conflict, which, if some think too pertinaciously, none will deny to have been ably fought, they commenced the attack under a persuasion, that the position of their oppo-

nents militated against the leading principles of Christianity. If man, they said, be capable of pleasing God by his own works, abstractedly considered, without divine assistance, where is the necessity, and what is the utility, of that assistance? Then taking the question in a higher point of view, they argued, that were it possible for the moral virtues of the mind by their own efficiency to render our persons acceptable to God, and obtain his lost favour, no need would exist of any other satisfaction for sin, and thus the whole scheme of Gospel redemption would have been fruitless, and Christ have died in vain (<sup>9</sup>). While therefore the doctrine of the Atonement presented nothing but “a cloud and darkness to their adversaries, it gave light by night to these;” on them it shone, amidst surrounding gloom, with lustre unobscured.

The controversy before us was among the first of those, which shook the Papal system to its foundation, and which, according to the custom of the times, were originally agitated in public disputations. The spirit of chivalry was not wholly extinguished; contending parties of different denominations, whether renowned for arts or for arms, entered the lists, prepared to decide every point  
at

at issue, the one by personal, the other by intellectual prowess. In literary digladiations, that the disgrace of a drawn battle might not be incurred, and that victory, when obtained, might be declared with more precision, the theses, which formed the basis for argument, were generally couched in terms, as remote as possible from those, which on the other side were admitted; terms, not indeed necessarily running into extremes, but strongly and broadly marking a contrariety of opinion. Hence it happens, that in taking a cursory view of some positions brought forward at the Reformation, after the mode and for the purpose alluded to, a modern reader is sometimes startled by the singular turn of the expressions, in which they are defined, and the striking boldness of the conclusions, to which they apparently tend: but his surprise abates, when he learns, with what design they were framed, and after what customary manner, as well as against what peculiar dogmas, it was intended to support them. This is particularly the case of the question under consideration, which, with others, some of less, but few of greater importance, was formally contested at the commencement of the Reformation in theological combat.

It was with a view to disputations of such a description, that Luther first advanced a proposition, which proved highly offensive to the Papists, and which they never ceased to condemn and calumniate. His assertion was, that he who exerts himself to the utmost of his ability still continues to sin; an assertion, in which the very essence of the controversy seems to be contained (<sup>10</sup>).

I have already observed, that, on the other side, unassisted man was thought incapable of performing an action remunerably good, or, as it was usually termed, condignly meritorious, even before his lapse; and that consequently, in his fallen state, all, to which he was conceived competent by his innate strength, was not to sin. When Luther therefore drew up his thesis against the tenet of congruous works, if little delicacy, yet some caution, and much discrimination, appeared requisite. Had he stated them to be thus good in a scholastical sense, which in a scholastical discussion was the only sense admissible, he would have completely lost sight of his object, and allowed more than even his opponents themselves. Had he described them as not demeritorious, or, in other words, not sinful, he would have precisely maintained the adverse position, and might conse-

consequently have spared his labour ; at the same time, that he would have tacitly acknowledged them to possess, what he could not consistently with truth attribute to them, every natural perfection of virtue and holiness. Under what denomination then could he class them, except under that of sinful ; a denomination which he the more readily adopted, because even among his adversaries themselves, the words Sin and Grace, as he remarked, were in general immediately opposed to each other ? <sup>(11)</sup>

Let us not however imagine, that the Lutherans on this occasion attempted to confuse together virtue and vice without distinction, from any absurd attachment to puerile paradox. Far was it from their intention to break down the sacred barriers of morality, and call evil good, or good evil ; to destroy what God has established in the human breast as the rule of reason, and the law of rectitude ; to depreciate that, which constitutes the firmest bond of social duty, and the true dignity of our nature in its connexion with this sublunary world : but, anxious to rescue Christian theology from the grasp of those, who embraced only to betray, they merely laboured to restore that importance to the doctrine of Redemption, with which

the Scriptures invest it, but of which, by a subtle perversity, it had long been deprived. The principal object therefore in their view evidently was, to christianize the speculations of the Schools; and the principal drift of their argument to prove, that human virtue, how extravagantly soever extolled by a vain philosophy, is wholly insufficient (because imperfect) to merit the favour of Heaven. Allowing no medium between righteousness and unrighteousness, the approbation and disapprobation of the Almighty (<sup>12</sup>), characterizing that as sinful, which is confessedly not holy, and thus annihilating every ground of self-presumption, they inculcated the necessity of contemplating with the eye of faith those means of reconciliation, which Christianity alone affords.

But obvious as seems the scope of their controversy, it has nevertheless been sometimes misconceived, and a tendency imputed to their principles abhorrent from their feelings. It has been insinuated, that their doctrine went to prove man's total inability of extricating himself from crime, until the arrival of some uncertain moment, which brings with it, without his own endeavours, a regeneration from on high, the sudden transfusion of a new light and new virtues. But those, who  
thus

thus conceive of it, are not probably aware that the author of the Augsbourgh Confession warmly reprobates this precise idea, which he denominates a Manichæan conceit and a horrible falsehood<sup>(13)</sup>. Upon the abstract question of Free Will it is indeed true, that Melancthon, no less than Luther, at first held opinions, which he was afterwards happy to retract: but when this is acknowledged, it should be added, that he made ample amends for his indiscretion, by not only expunging the offensive passages from the single work, which contained them, but by introducing others of a nature diametrically opposite. And although the more inflexible coadjutor of Melancthon was too proud to correct what he had once made public, and too magnanimous to regard the charge of inconsistency, which his adversaries urged against him; yet what his better judgment approved clearly appears from a preface, written not long before his death; in which, while he expressed an anxiety to have his own chaotic labours, as he styled them, buried in eternal oblivion, he recommended in strong terms, as a work admirably adapted to form the Christian Divine, that very performance of his friend, which was remarkable

able for something more than a mere recantation of the opinions alluded to (<sup>14</sup>).

But to return to the leading point of the topic in contemplation, it appears upon the whole, that the great object of the Lutherans, in thus opposing human ability, was very different from what some have conjectured; and that their attacks were solely levelled against the proud presumption of congruous works. We must not however hence conclude, that their objection was only applicable to these; it likewise applied to condign, to those which were performed with, as well as those which were performed without, the assistance of grace; for in both instances they disallowed the plea of personal merit, in the scholastical, strict, and only proper sense of that expression. It was not therefore against any conceived deficiency in the quality of our virtue that they argued, but against its supposed competency, whether wrought in or out of grace, with greater or less degrees of purity to effect that, which the oblation of Christ alone accomplishes. Upon both points Luther treated the doctrine of his adversaries as altogether frivolous, and incapable of corroboration by a single fact; as the idle speculation of vain men, who trifled with



with the mercy of God and the misery of man, who, exalting their own wisdom above the divine, slighted, if not despised, the efficacy of that redemption, which Christianity has revealed to reconcile justice with compassion, to subdue our fears, and to animate our hopes (<sup>15</sup>).

Futile however as the scholastical tenet appeared to be, although deficient in proof, and unsupported by example, upon this, he remarked with indignation and grief, was founded the whole system of Papal delusion. Congruous merit was said infallibly to produce condign; and, in the application of them to practical purposes, both were thought principally to consist in various external works of piety, and superstitious observances; the extravagant veneration of which extended the authority of the Church, and augmented its wealth and splendour; filled Rome with vanity, and Europe with absurdity. Besides the obvious acts of devotion and mortification within the compass of vulgar ability, the most romantic system of virtue was adopted; orders of various kinds were invented, and vows encouraged of almost every thing, which affected the lusts of the flesh, or the pride of life. Secluding themselves from all temporal concerns, some entered  
into

into solitude, and forgetting the world, forgot many important purposes, for which they came into it; solicitous to discharge their duty to God, they neglected, what he equally enjoined, their duty to man. Saints were believed to abound in merits beyond what their own immediate exigences required; and not only to possess such supererogatory treasures for the public good, but to preserve them even after death; in their very relics was supposed to exist a communicable property of holiness, and virtue to be derived from prostration before the shrines dedicated to their names. Pilgrimages were consequently held in universal estimation, and conceived more worthy of divine regard, if attended with difficulties and dangers, particularly when directed to that favoured land, where God dispensed his covenanted mercies to mankind. But Pilgrims were not the only devotees, whom Christianity blushed to behold in Judea: there the votaries of the Cross, erecting in her cause their hallowed standards, imbrued their hands in the blood of Infidels, to obtain the remission of their sins, and the salvation of their souls.

Such were some of the consequences resulting from the doctrine of human merit; consequences, which, in Luther's idea, rendered

dered it no less odious than contemptible. Upon these he anxiously fixed his eye, and, in order to annihilate the evil, laboured with a zeal, which we cannot censure, and with a sincerity, which we must applaud, to cut off the corrupted source, from which it flowed.



---

## S E R M O N V.

JOHN XV. 5.

*Without me ye can do nothing.*

HAVING in a former Lecture endeavoured to explain the doctrine of congruous merit, as supported by the Church of Rome, and opposed by the Lutherans, I proceed to consider the sentiments of our own Reformers upon the same subject.

I have observed, that among the Articles of our Church there are two, which evidently relate to this much controverted question ; the one upon Free Will, the other upon Works before Justification. The object of the latter, from the allusions which it contains, it seems impossible to mistake ; nor is that of the former less apparent, when we consider its general tendency, and the peculiar phraseology of the Schools, in which it is expressed. Both therefore take but one and that the same obvious direction, alike asserting  
our

our incompetency to please God, and obtain his favour by our own merits, in contempt of those, to which the eye of faith should be alone directed.

But because our Church ascribes not to human virtue, contemplated as independent of Christianity, the power of conciliating divine approbation, we must not hence conclude, that she restricts the uncovenanted mercies of God, withholding salvation from Heathens, upon whom, walking in darkness and the shadow of death, the light of the blessed Gospel has never arisen. Although persuaded “that there is none other name  
“under heaven given to man, in which, and  
“through which, we can receive health and  
“salvation, but only the name of Christ;” although rejecting the creed of the Infidel as vain, who, actuated by presumption and pride, treads under foot the Son of God, and deems the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing; yet she determines not the case of the Gentile world, or in any way solves a question foreign to her purpose. Indeed the real sentiments of our Reformers upon this point appear to have been different from those, which some have imputed to them. For while, like Luther, whose private opinion upon it was  
neverthe-

nevertheless far from being contracted (<sup>1</sup>), they established nothing directly upon the subject, they indirectly seemed to assert, what Zuingli had boldly and publicly taught, that the Kingdom of Heaven is open to Heathens as well as Christians (<sup>2</sup>); at least, in the liberal language of the Zuinglians, they held the oblation of Christ upon the cross to be “a perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world.” (<sup>3</sup>)

In the Articles, however, immediately under review, they proposed to themselves another object: in these they meant not to launch out into any unnecessary speculations, but to attack in one of its strong holds the pride of scholastical sophistry; to oppose the presumptuous doctrine of congruous merit. Of a position as remote from the humility, as adverse to the principles, of the Gospel, it was impossible for those to approve, who in their search after Christian truth were solely guided by the genuine oracles of Christianity. With perfect unanimity therefore they maintained, against the favourite Theology of the times, that our natural powers are inadequate to the annihilation of crime, and the recovery of God's lost favour, or, as they expressed themselves with this view in the

Homilies, “ that of ourselves and by ourselves we have no goodnefs, help, or falvation ; but that all comes to us only through the great mercy of God by Chrift (<sup>4</sup>).” But their zeal upon the fame point was further inflamed by the misapplications of the scholaftical tenet, which the Church of Rome had countenanced, and the misconceptions refpecting it, which prevailed in the minds of an ignorant laity. The people were taught, that much efficacy was derivable from a compliance with mere external acts of devotion ; hence little attention was paid to inward principles of action, and the religion of the heart became difregarded, while that of the lip was fcrupuloufly adhered to. At a period, therefore, when common fenfe had begun to dethrone fophiftry, and reaffert her dominion over the human mind, and when evangelical fimplicity had effected its efcape from the metaphyfical labyrinths, in which it had long been bewildered, to have preferved a ftubborn filence upon fuch a doctrine would have been deemed culpable, and to have attempted any modification of it even criminal.

The Article which I propofe firft to confider is that upon Free Will. But before I proceed to examine its contents, I fhould  
premise,



premise, that it consists of two separate clauses, framed at different periods ; that the former was added in the reign of Elizabeth, and adopted almost verbatim from the Wirtemberg Confession (<sup>5</sup>) ; and that the latter contained the whole of the Article, as it originally existed, which was principally taken from a passage in the writings of St. Austin, altered so as to receive a particular and appropriate application (<sup>6</sup>). Regardless, however, of its general construction, and directing their attention solely to modern controversies, some have conjectured, that it is entirely Calvinistical ; others, that it at least steers a middle course between the two extremes of Calvinism on one side, and Arminianism on the other. Although in these collateral topics, the discussion of which would lead me too far from the track proposed, I mean not to interfere, it may nevertheless be proper to remark, that since the first part of the Article was extracted from a Lutheran Confession, composed for exhibition in the Council of Trent, and the last chiefly derived from a more ancient source, those, who choose to consider it as connected with the Predestinarian system, cannot at least support their argument by alleging, that

it was drawn up with an eye to the language and sentiments of Calvin.

Contemplating then the subject of Free Will only as it is allied to the tenet of congruous merit, the Article states “ the condition of man after the fall of Adam to be such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his natural strength, and good works, to faith and calling upon God.” That the object of this paragraph is that to which I allude, the very expressions “ to turn and prepare himself by his natural strength and good works” distinctly prove ; expressions borrowed from the phraseology of the Scholastics, and appropriated to the controversy under our consideration. By them it was argued, as on a former occasion I remarked, that although we cannot live spiritually without the infusion of a certain supernatural principle, to form our virtues, (not to improve their nature, but merely adorn them, and give them a celestial adaptation,) we can nevertheless by our own energies so dispose our minds for the infusion of such a principle, as to deserve it congruously, the previous disposition of the subject-matter for the reception of the form (which never fails of its intended effect) being producible

ducible by our own individual exertions. In contradistinction to this idea, which subverts the foundation of our surest hopes, and renders Revelation nugatory, our Church maintains, that through man's first transgression we are become incapable of thus disposing ourselves to the true spiritual life, to the faith and invocation of God, "*ad fidem et invocationem Dei* (<sup>7</sup>)," and consequently of regaining that state of acceptance, by our own dignity, without the mediation of Christ, of which the lapse of Adam has deprived us. For, in the conception of our Reformers, to assert, that so much integrity remains in our natural powers, with the certainty of leading to so beneficial a result, was to assert a position, which supercedes Christianity.

The scope of the concluding clause seems precisely similar to that of the one, which I have attempted to illustrate, while on some points perhaps it is even more express and particular. It affirms, "that we cannot do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without his grace by Christ preventing us and cooperating with us." If the peculiar tendency of this clause were not otherwise manifest, the scholastical terms, "works pleasant and acceptable to God," would sufficiently point it out; especially when it is

considered, that these words are not to be found in the author, from whom the principal part of the passage was taken, but were inserted by our Reformers, in order thus to fix its application. With respect to the argument itself, its object is to prove, that by the exertion of our natural powers we cannot please God congruously, but that for this purpose the assistance of grace is requisite; not of that grace, it is added, still further to carry on the contrast, which we can merit by a previous preparation, but which Christ has merited for us, "*gratia, quæ per Christum est;*" (expressions, we should likewise observe, not used by <sup>(8)</sup> St. Austin;) nor of that, which being acquired by an act of the will, must necessarily be consequent to it, but which prevents, or more properly precedes such an act, and cooperates with the mind in the production of it. The inference deducible from hence is obvious. It is this; that as human ability by its own efficiency cannot claim acceptance with God, but is incompetent to a due renovation of the heart, to that, which, as it is expressed in our Homilies, is not "*man's only work without God* <sup>(9)</sup>," we must look for other means to appease the anger, and obtain the approbation of heaven.

But,

But, although the strict philosophical question respecting the freedom of the mind appears not to be involved in the enquiry, some have endeavoured so to interpret the word “prevent,” as if it meant not simply to go before the act of the will, but to impede the liberty of its action; and, forgetful of what follows, have contended for the idea of such an inoperation, as entirely excludes all personal agency. To enter into an explanation of this word, before those whom I am addressing, would be superfluous; it may nevertheless, perhaps, be proper to observe, that it was used in the English language according to the more obvious sense of it in the Latin, even subsequently to the Reformation; a fact, which our common translation of the Bible sufficiently proves. “We,” it is there said, “which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not *prevent* them that are asleep, but shall be caught up together with them in the clouds.” (10) When, however, any doubt arises with regard either to the meaning or the construction of an Article, the Latin, and not the English, copy ought always to be consulted; because this, as a mere translation, has been differently printed in different editions; while that, as the original, has never

varied. If then we refer to the Latin, the force of the expression, in the sense which I have annexed to it, will not only be apparent from the general use of it in that language, but be fully corroborated by another circumstance. For by comparing the Article with the source from which it was derived, we perceive, that, instead of the term *operans*, which St. Austin adopted, our Reformers substituted (and certainly not without design) that of *præveniens*, a term studiously selected to point out the period, and not the mode, of divine assistance, when considered separately, and when combined with the remainder of the definition, to point out, that grace does not, as the Scholastics held, follow, but precede, the acceptable will, and concur with us in producing it.

To establish however such an interpretation beyond controversy, it may be objected, that a further change seems requisite; that the cooperation should have been specifically represented as taking place before the disposition is actually formed, and while it is yet only in formation. Prove this, it may be said, and the conclusion will be inevitable. Now it is singular, that a change of the kind alluded to has been made in the language of St.

St. Austin ; that the sentence, which in him is read, “ Cooperante *cum* volumus,” was altered by our Reformers, to avoid all ambiguity, into “ Cooperante *dum* volumus ;” the conjunction *dum* being manifestly chosen for the express purpose of unequivocally asserting a cooperation during the continuance of volition, while the act of the mind is incomplete, and still in a state of progression <sup>(11)</sup>. Thus, in opposition to the creed of their adversaries, while they considered grace as a cause, and not a consequence, of the will, they held it not to be the sole, but only a concomitant, cause ; and, anxious in the extreme to express themselves without obscurity on this point, they so corrected the passage, upon which the clause was modelled, as to convey their meaning with precision, and to prevent, one would conceive, the very possibility of a misconstruction.

To their object in so strenuously maintaining the cooperation of divine aid, at a period previous to the actual volition of good, I have already alluded : it was simply to oppose the offensive doctrine of congruous merit, as the means of pleasing God, and of obtaining grace without Christianity ; a doctrine, which in their ear sounded so hollow as to ring at every touch.

Upon

Upon this construction, therefore, which seems the most appropriate and consistent, it is evident, that they considered not the intricate subject of Free Will in a general, but only in a particular, point of view ; averting from a controversy, which is rather calculated to gratify polemical vanity, than promote personal humility, and which is seldom discussed without sacrificing the simplicity of Christian truth to the pride of metaphysical talent. Although they denied not that the decency of moral, and the dignity of philosophical virtue are within the sphere of our natural ability, they nevertheless argued, that virtue merely human possesses not a propitiatory and mediatorial efficacy, that we can neither render ourselves acceptable to God, and yield him the homage of a spiritual obedience without grace, nor without Christ obtain from him that invaluable aid by our own deservings. While they esteemed the heart to be the consecrated altar of pure religion, they taught, that its oblations should be offered up in the name of him, whose perfections abundantly supply our defects, and be hallowed by the sacred fire, which comes down from Heaven ; by that grace of God through Christ, (*gratia, quæ per Christum est,*) which is conferred upon us without  
our



our own deserts, not to make us vainer, but better, to sanctify our feelings, and regulate our dispositions, and so to free us from the servitude of sin, that, “running the way of “ God’s commandments, we may obtain his “ gracious promises, and be made partakers “ of his heavenly treasure.” (<sup>12</sup>)

Having explained the Article upon “ Free “ Will,” I proceed to that upon “ Works “ before Justification,” which is manifestly of the same tendency, both being opposed to the position of congruous merit; the former denying the competency of the will, the latter the acceptability of the work. Yet obvious as this appears to be, it has not unfrequently been overlooked or disregarded; and the word Justification been contemplated only in the sense, in which it is applied by the followers of Calvin. But our Reformers entertained no such idea of its application. They believed it not to be a blessing, which we may in vain sigh to behold above our reach, granted to certain individuals alone, and always granted irrespectively, by a divine decree, fixed and immutable; but one, which we all possess in infancy, and of which nothing but our own folly can afterwards deprive us. They never asserted the total inability of a Christian to perform a good action, or even  
think

think a good thought, until the arrival of some destined moment, when it shall please God, without his own endeavours, to illuminate his understanding, and renovate his affections. The gift of grace, not to be purchased by human merit, but always bestowed gratuitously, they confined not to a selected few, the predestinated favourites of Heaven, but extended to all, who neither by wilful perversity oppose its reception, nor, when received, by actual crime discard it. On the present occasion, indeed, they simply regarded Works before Justification as those, which were more usually denominated works of Congruity, adopting perhaps the former term in preference, because it was precisely that, which had been recently used in the same sense by the Council of Trent <sup>(13)</sup>.

But this is not the only error, which has prevailed in the general conception of this Article. Another of the same description has arisen in the minds of those, who have annexed to the word "inspiration," which is to be found in it, a too modern interpretation. Let us not, however, so grossly misapprehend the Restorers of a rational Christianity, as to suppose, that by this expression they intended to patronize the dreams of Enthusiasts, and to lay the foundation of that  
childish

childish fabric of absurdities, which sometimes weak but well meaning, sometimes designing and wicked, men have raised in later times, and made an object of concern to sober Christians, and of contempt to Infidels: that they understood by it a certain incomprehensible operation upon the soul of man by the Spirit of God, of which much has been written, but little understood; which few are conceived to feel, and which none can intelligibly describe. How much soever it may since have been abused, it then conveyed no indistinct meaning, nor mystical allusion; it had not then been rendered obscure in its definition, or suspicious in its tendency, by enthusiastical conceit. Inspiration, according to them, is nothing more than that sacred influence promised by the Gospel, which, in the language of our Liturgy, “cleanses the thoughts of our hearts, “that we may perfectly love, and worthily “magnify God’s holy name;” it is that divine assistance, which is conferred upon us all, before it is possible for us to experience the assaults of temptation, and never totally forsakes us from the cradle to the grave, unless when obstructed in its effects by the indulgence of sensual appetite, and the commission of deliberate crime.

The

The Article states, that “ works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God; forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither (as the School authors say) do they deserve grace of congruity; yea rather for that they are not done as God has willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.” After the observations which have been made, this Article will require but little illustration. It relates wholly to works contemplated in themselves abstractedly; a subject upon which, we must be convinced, that it was necessary at the time to animadvert, when we recollect the efficacy, which the Church of Rome attributed to mere external performances; when we recollect, that the bare participation of the Sacraments, and discharge of social duties, were deemed congruously meritorious, *ex opere operato*, even in sinners, who still continue polluted by mortal crime. In opposition to conceits in every point of view so obnoxious, so delusive in theory, and pernicious in practice, our Church simply contends, that those works are by no means pleasing to God, which spring not from the faith of Christ, “ *ex fide Jesu Christi;*” which,

which, whatsoever other virtue they may claim, avowedly proceed not from any principle of Christian piety. Let us not, however, hence imagine, that she imputes to faith, as to an operation of the mind under a superior agency, that, which she denies to the sole exertion of our natural powers; for neither on this, or on any other occasion, does she attribute the acceptance of our performances to the *act* of faith, but to the *object* of it; “to the merits of Christ alone, on “account of which,” as Cranmer expressed himself upon the same subject, “we being “sorry that we cannot do all things more “exquisitely and duly, our works shall be “accepted and taken as most exquisite, pure, “and perfect.” (14)

To prevent therefore every misconception on this head, and to point out the true cause why congruous works are inefficient, she adds, “forasmuch as they are not done as “God has willed and commanded them to “be done,” because they are in themselves imperfect, “we doubt not but they have the “nature of sin.” In what sense the Lutherans applied this term to them, I have already explained. That our Reformers characterized them by so strong an appellation upon a similar principle, upon the ground of their imper-

imperfection, seems manifest from the reason which was adduced, “ forasmuch as they are “ not done as God has willed and command- “ ed them to be done ;” for “ let us not be “ ashamed,” they elsewhere remarked, “ to “ confess plainly our state of imperfection, “ since we cannot rejoice in any works that “ we do, which are all so imperfect and im- “ pure, that they are not able to stand before “ the righteous judgment-seat of God.” (<sup>15</sup>) But while they supported with the Lutherans the negative side of a proposition, which their adversaries had for ages maintained affirmatively, the existence of a middle state between merit and demerit, which, exempt from the defects of the latter, entitled to the advantages, and even assumed the name, of the former, they never intended by the appellation “ sinful” to erase a moral action from the catalogue of virtues, or to consider it as neither commendable nor good ; but merely to oppose its exaltation above its appropriate character, and its investiture with the high office of conciliation between man and his offended Creator.

Upon a general review then of these Articles, we perceive, that both were solely framed with an eye to Romish error, and are in no respect connected with the Calvin-  
istical

istical controversy of Free Will, as the hinge, upon which principally turns the doctrine of an absolute Predestination. Calvin had indeed begun the attempt of giving that peculiar bias to the subject, labouring to divert it from the track, which it had previously pursued : but some writers, either not knowing, or, if knowing, disregarding its real destination, argue as if this was its original direction, instead of being a manifest deviation from its proper course ; nor do they recollect, that the system, which has since been so much idolized, was then so far from having obtained general approbation, that it was only in the first instance attracting public attention to its singularities. Zealous likewise for a favourite opinion, they at the same time forget, or at least choose not to notice, that our Church evidently maintains that very cooperation of man with the grace of God, which Calvin denied ; and have thus endeavoured to press into the service of their cause an Article, which, as far as it bears a collateral affinity to the question, completely makes against them. For upon this important topic our Reformers coincided not with the harsh, unqualified sentiments of the Reformer of Geneva, but with those of the Lutherans, as contained in the most celebrated

I

lebrated performance of the day, the *Loci Theologici* of Melancthon (<sup>16</sup>). And here, it should be subjoined, was the Church of England always uniform, asserting, at every period of her progress towards perfection, the consistency of Free Will with preventing and cooperating Grace, in a language, which cannot easily be misconceived, or misapplied (<sup>17</sup>). This was the doctrine which she taught, when the yoke of the imperious Henry lay heavy on the neck of Reformation; and this she still continued to teach, when she trod the pride of Popery in the dust, and when her triumph corresponded with her most sanguine wishes.

It cannot therefore be too frequently repeated, that the great object of the Articles, which have been considered, was by no means what many have conjectured it to be; it was not to exalt Calvinistical speculation, but to lower scholastical presumption, by opposing the dangerous delusion of preparatory works. For while the philosophical Papist boasted of challenging the approbation of Heaven by the arrogant display of moral virtue, and the superstitious one, by the scrupulous discharge of external observances, (merit in either case considered abstractedly, and in contempt of the Christian sacrifice for sin,) by the principle



ple contained in these the more humble Protestant was instructed to solicit so valuable a blessing, as a gift procured for him by the sufferings and death of his Redeemer, to place in human dignity no groundless foundation of hope; but, persuaded that even his best performances cannot on their own account prove acceptable to Almighty God, because replete with failings, to renounce every meritorious claim, and receive with gratitude that gracious redemption, which, undiscoverable by reason, the sacred page of Revelation alone discloses.



---

## S E R M O N VI.

ROMANS iii. 24, 25.

*Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption, that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood.*

FEW subjects have afforded more scope for controversy, or produced a greater variety of distinctions without a difference, of definitions sometimes inaccurately conceived on one side, and often totally misrepresented on the other, than the plain doctrine of faith in the propitiatory blood of a Redeemer. Human ingenuity has been exhausted to prove, what, at the time it was stated, human intellect cannot comprehend: the appeal has been made to feeling rather than to argument; to certain internal persuasions and convincing experiences, as they have been called, which mock the powers of language to describe, and elude all rational investigation. While the judgment has been restrained, the imagination has received an unlimited indulgence; and the love of mystery frequently

superfeded the sober enquiry after truth. But to questions of this description, as the spurious productions of a more recent period, the topic, which comes next to be discussed, is in no respect allied. Averting therefore from more modern and of course irrelevant disquisitions upon this subject, brought forward by a class of theological disputants, who had in view a new object, and consequently gave a new turn to the question, I shall endeavour simply to consider it, as it was originally contested between the Lutherans and the Church of Rome.

But here, to avoid a misconception of the argument, it seems necessary previously to state in what sense the word Justification, which comprehends the sole ground of contention, was used by the opposing parties. Upon both sides it was supposed entirely to consist in the remission of sin (<sup>1</sup>).

The Scholastics on this head were remarkably distinct in their ideas, and express in their language. They represented it as an effect produced by the infusion of divine grace into a mind properly disposed; not as consequent to a well spent life, but as preceding all remunerable obedience as the intervening point between night and day, the gloom of a guilty and the light of a self approving

proving conscience ; or in other words, and to adopt their own phraseology, as the exact boundary where merit of congruity ends, and merit of condignity begins, the infallible result of a previous disposition on our part, which never fails of alluring from on high that supernatural quality, which, being itself love, renders the soul beloved (<sup>2</sup>).

While the Lutherans however adhered to the general import of the term, as understood in the Schools, they waged an incessant warfare upon another point ; while they allowed, that justification consists in the remission of sin, they denied, that this remission is to be acquired by the merit of the individual. Their opponents maintained, that man is justified in the sight of God in consequence of his own preparation, and on account of his personal qualities. They on the other hand argued, with an inflexibility, which admitted of no compromise, that, possessing not merits of his own to plead, he freely received forgiveness through the mercy of God solely on account of the merits of Christ. The effective principle, therefore, or *meritorious cause* of justification, it should be observed, was the great point contested.

But before I particularize the doctrine of the Lutherans upon this subject, it will be

requisite more at large to explain that of their adversaries.

To investigate it however minutely, to trace it through its circuitous channels, and mark its progress, winding in all the fantastical curves of metaphysical vanity, would prove a tedious as well as unnecessary task. The principle of it still remains the same, and constantly recurs to the eye how much soever varied.

When the sinner, conscious of his past transgressions, enquired where he was to seek the expiation of his crime, and deliverance from the dreadful consequences of it, their general answer was in the merit of penitence, a merit capable of annihilating guilt, and appeasing the anger of incensed Omnipotence. He, they argued, who, having disobeyed the laws of heaven, is desirous of returning into that state of acceptance, from which he has fallen, must not expect free forgiveness ; but previously by unfeigned sorrow of heart deserve the restoration of grace, and with it the obliteration of his offences. To effect this desirable purpose he is bound strictly to survey and detest his former conduct, accurately to enumerate his transgressions, and deeply feel them, and, impressed with a due sense of their magnitude, impurity, and consequences,

sequences, to condemn his folly, and deplore his fault, which have made him an outcast of heaven, and exposed him to eternal misery. So far he can proceed by that operation of the mind, which they denominated Attrition, and which being within the sphere of his natural powers they regarded as congruous piety meritorious of justification, as a preparation of the soul more or less necessary to receive and merit justifying grace. When he is arrived therefore at this point, attrition ceases, and contrition commences; the habit of sin is expelled, while that of holiness is superinduced in its stead, and with the infusion of charity, the plastic principle of a new obedience, justification becomes complete. But even here it was not conceived, that a total deliverance takes place; a liberation from guilt and eternal punishment is effected; but not from temporal, which is never remitted, unless either by the infliction of some personal suffering or satisfactory compensation required of him, who is already justified and approved by heaven. To accomplish however this remaining object nothing more is wanting, than a continuation to a sufficient intensity of that compunction of heart, which is now denominated Contrition, grace supplying the defects of nature, and enabling penitential merit

rit not only to justify, but obtain exemption from punishment of every species (3).

Such was the favourite doctrine of the Scholastics respecting penitence, and such the efficacy, which they attributed to it. But so great appeared to them the frailty of man and the severity of God, that no inconsiderable difficulty occurred in the due application of it to individuals; for the means of expiation they imagined ought always to be proportionate to the magnitude of the offences. How, they reasoned, are we to be assured, that our contrition has been either sufficient or sincere, and whether it has been so in the obliteration not only of one crime, but of all; whether it has atoned for past transgressions of every kind, the number of which may perplex, as well as their guilt confound us? Hence, they added, in ordinary cases a constant succession of doubts must arise in the mind of the penitent; to which soever side he turns, a cloud of uncertainty hangs over the darkening prospect; nor is it possible for his conscience to be at rest, while all is gloom without, and terror within.

Instead therefore of penitence in its strictest acceptation, as a perfect virtue, God, they said, in condescension to human infirmity, has substituted



substituted for general practice the Sacrament of it, which requires only for the attainment of full remission a moderate compunction of soul, with confession to the Priest, and the discharge of such satisfaction, as he may enjoin. And, still lower to reduce the terms of acceptance, they even argued, that it is not absolutely necessary for the penitent to experience an entire conversion of heart, but only not to oppose the impediment of mortal crime, to feel some displeasure at his past conduct, and to express a resolution of amending it in future (\*).

But after all, and in spite of the boasted authority of the Keys, complete confidence in divine forgiveness was never inculcated; for it was neither the interest nor inclination of the Church of Rome to teach the simple doctrine of Christian Faith, but rather to involve it in metaphysical obscurity. Under the pretext therefore of relieving the throbbing breast from its apprehensions, they had recourse to numerous inventions for propping the insecure fabric of penitential hope; asserting among other extravagancies, that the Sacraments are in themselves efficacious by virtue of their own operation, exclusively of all merit in the recipient; and that the Sacrament of the altar in particular  
acts

acts so powerfully in this respect as to communicate grace, not only to those, who partake of it, but to others, for whom it is received by substitution, provided that its operation be not impeded by flagrant immorality. And so deeply rooted in the public mind was the persuasion of its thus effecting the best of purposes, and that even without the necessity of an actual participation of it by him, upon whom the benefit is conferred, that the celebration of the Mass was universally regarded as the means of appeasing the anger of Heaven and obtaining pardon and peace, of procuring divine assistance for the living, and for the dead deliverance from the bitter pains of purgatory (<sup>s</sup>).

Nor by the Sacraments alone, but, as I have already sufficiently remarked, by every good external work, as well as internal disposition, was justifying grace supposed to be merited congruously, and satisfaction for sin to be made condignly.

In monastical institutions likewise were found no mean materials for similar purposes, particularly for the latter; “in those feigned  
“religions,” as our Homilies describe them,  
“the devotees of which boasted of having  
“lamps, which ran always over, conceiving  
“themselves capable of satisfying not only  
“for

“ for their own sins, but likewise for all  
“ other their benefactors, brothers, and sisters  
“ of religion . . . . . and therefore keeping in  
“ divers places (as it were) marts and markets  
“ of merits, being full of their holy relics,  
“ images, shrines, and works of overflowing  
“ abundance ready to be sold (°).” Yet whether the dubious penitent was instructed to derive consolation from the efficacy of the Sacraments, from his own personal qualities, or from any of what Cranmer aptly termed “ the fantastical works of man’s invention (”) ,” it should be observed, that he was not directly taught to consider these, as wholly superseding the virtue of repentance, but as supplying his deficiencies in the performance of it ; an incongruous system of atonement, fabricated by the avarice of Rome, and the obsequiousness of scholastical philosophy, to augment the treasures and extend the influence of the Church, to extinguish the light of Gospel truth, and, while keeping the world at large in ignorance, to hold the conscience of the individual in slavery.

Upon the whole then the Scholastics maintained, that justification is unattainable without repentance, at least without some degree of attrition on our part ; but in the common apprehension of the doctrine even  
this

this seems to have been forgotten, and merit of congruity considered in a general point of view as alone efficacious. Thus good works of every species preceding grace were said to deserve it; and by deserving grace to deserve the justifying principle. And always were they careful to impute the cause of forgiveness, not to the mercy of God in Christ, but to the sole change in the individual, to his transmutation from a state of unrighteousness to one of righteousness, “transmutationem a statu injustitiæ ad statum justitiæ,” to his possession of a quality, which renders him a worthy object of divine approbation<sup>(8)</sup>. For in every instance personal merit was conceived to be the solid basis, upon which rests the complete remission of sin. To this they constantly looked as to that sun of righteousness, which illuminating the heart of man attracts the eye of heaven to the brightness of its rising; forgetful of the prophetic announcement to the Church of Christ, “the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God, thy glory.”<sup>(9)</sup>

Having thus briefly explained the doctrine of the Scholastics on this subject, I proceed to that, which on the other side was opposed to it by the Lutherans.

Upon

Upon no one point, perhaps, has the opinion of Luther been more misrepresented than upon this. For, unmindful of that, with which only it ought to have been contrasted, some have ascribed to it a solifidian tendency, if not of the most enthusiastical, at least of the most unqualified, description. It must however be confessed, that the cursory reader of his works is at all times liable to mistake him, in consequence of the involved construction of his style, too frequently confused by a verbose circumlocution, which, as he was himself fully sensible, oppressed the exuberance of his conception, and the energy of his expression <sup>(10)</sup>. When therefore we find, that particular passages have been selected from his voluminous productions, (productions often republished, but never revived,) and wrested from their true meaning, although we may regret the perversion, we cannot be surpris'd at it.

But upon the question before us, it seems indeed impossible accurately to comprehend the position, which he maintained, if we examine it in an insulated point of view, unless we connect it with that, of which in the Church of Rome it properly formed a part, and from which he never intended to separate it, the doctrine of penitence. In opposing

posing the absurdity of Papal indulgences, the first impiety against which his manly mind revolted, a ray of light, before unnoticed, darted upon him, and opened a completely new scene, which, while it stimulated his efforts as a Reformer, animated his hopes as a Christian. Hence averting with disdain from the speculations of Sophists, and turning to the sacred page of Revelation, he there beheld an assurance very different from what the Schools inculcated; and thus, while *their* vain language was, “ Repent, and trust  
“ to the efficacy of your contrition, either  
“ with or without extraneous works, according to the degree of its intensity, for the  
“ expiation of your offences,” *his*, more scriptural and more consoling, became simply this;  
“ Repent, and trust not for expiation to your  
“ own merits of any kind, but solely to those  
“ of your Redeemer.”

In contemplating therefore the tenet of the Lutherans, we ought never to consider it as detached from penitence. Rejecting the dreams of their adversaries with respect to the nature and effects of this important duty, they represented it as consisting of two essential parts, contrition, and faith, the latter as always associated with the former. Hence in the apology of their Confession they repeatedly declared a  
disavowal

disavowal of all faith, except such as exists in the contrite heart (<sup>11</sup>). Far was it from their intention to encourage the presumptuous or fanatical sinner in a false security; their object was very different and more laudable; they laboured to fix the eye of him, who both laments and detests his offences, upon the only deserving object of human confidence and divine complacency. Properly then, as they frequently remarked, their doctrine of justification was appropriated to troubled consciences, at every period of true repentance, and particularly at the awful hour of death, when the time for habitual proofs of amendment has elapsed, and when the past appears replete with guilt, and the future with terror (<sup>12</sup>). At such moments, they taught not, with the Schools, an affiance in human merit, but in the gratuitous mercy of God through Christ: to contrition, as a preparatory qualification, or previous requisite, they added faith, and from faith they deemed every principle of real piety and virtue inseparable. When therefore they urged a justification by faith alone, they meant not to exclude repentance, and every good disposition connected with it; but merely to oppose that, for which their adversaries principally contended, and which, in their conception,

K

ception, struck at the very root of Christianity, the obliteration of crime by the merit of the individual, instead of the atonement of a Saviour (<sup>13</sup>).

But although they stated penitence to consist only of the two parts alluded to, when they strictly defined it as embracing, according to the idea of the Schools, the means and immediate effects of justification, yet when they considered it, as a general rule of Christian duty and a total conversion, they added a third part, actual obedience (<sup>14</sup>). In this point of view, and in this alone, good works, or the outward fruits of an inward renovation of mind, were said to follow remission of sins, internal necessarily preceding external reformation. For the individual, they argued, must himself be good before the action can be so denominated, be justified before it can be deemed just, and accepted before it can prove acceptable, distinguishing between the primary admission into God's favour and the subsequent preservation of that favour. The terms then of acceptance on the sinner's part they held to be Contrition, (or as in modern language it is more usually termed, Repentance,) and Faith connected with every devout affection; the necessary consequences as well as proofs of this state of acceptance, good works,  
or



or external acts of obedience, and the rule of retribution in the world to come, the whole of man, including both his inward impressions and outward demonstrations of holiness (<sup>15</sup>).

After having thus endeavoured to remove from the doctrine of the Lutherans those dark spots, which in the eye of some, who contemplate it through an indistinct medium, appear to obscure its lustre, there will be little occasion of dwelling upon that, which our own Church maintains in the same sense and on a similar principle. Both in their object and tendency perfectly accord; but the latter is, if possible, more guarded than the former against the obliquities of Enthusiasm. Our Church asserts, “ that we are ac-  
 “ counted righteous before God, for the  
 “ merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,  
 “ by faith, and not for our own works and  
 “ deserving;” and then adds, that “justifica-  
 “ tion by faith alone is a most wholesome  
 “ doctrine, and very full of comfort, as is  
 “ more largely expressed in the Homily upon  
 “ that subject.” By referring to the Homily alluded to, we find the obvious meaning of the Article to be, that we are esteemed righteous in the sight of God solely for the sake of Christ, and not rendered perfectly so in point of fact, as the Papists held, by

our own virtues, which we are told “are  
 “ far too weak, insufficient, and imperfect, to  
 “ deserve the remission of our sins;” and  
 that we are thus reputed righteous, not on  
 account of the act but the object of faith,  
 on account of him, in whom alone we are  
 to trust, yet in whom we are not entitled to  
 trust, except upon a previous condition, ex-  
 cept “ we truly repent, and turn to God un-  
 “ feignedly.” (16) For when we are said, as  
 the same Homily remarks, to be justified by  
 faith only, it is not meant “ that this our  
 “ own act to believe in Christ . . . . . doth  
 “ justify us, . . . . . for that were to count  
 “ ourselves to be justified by some act or vir-  
 “ tue that is within ourselves, . . . . . nor  
 “ that the said justifying faith is alone in  
 “ man without true repentance, hope, chari-  
 “ ty, the dread and fear of God at any time  
 “ and season;” but the purport of such ex-  
 pressions “ is to take away clearly all merit  
 “ of our works, as being unable to deserve  
 “ our justification at God’s hands, . . . . .  
 “ Christ himself only being the cause merito-  
 “ rious thereof.” (17)

To enter into a minuter examination of  
 the doctrine, which our Church inculcates on  
 this point, after what has been advanced, seems  
 unnecessary. It ought not however to be  
 omitted,

omitted, that the very definition, which she gives of the word Faith in another Homily composed at the same period, is admirably calculated to preclude the worst of errors upon the most important topic of Christianity; it is defined to be a trust in God that our offences are obliterated by the blood of Christ, not when we believe them to be thus obliterated, but “whensoever we repenting truly return to him with our whole heart, stedfastly determining with ourselves through his grace to obey and serve him in keeping his commandments.”<sup>(18)</sup> It is likewise worthy of observation, that in our office for the Visitation of the Sick, the Minister, after rehearsing to the person visited the Articles of our Belief, is directed to require of him, not to ascertain what some in the present day would perhaps think preferable, whether he ever possessed a consciousness of that saving principle, which when once obtained is supposed never afterwards to be lost, or whether he feels an internal confidence, that his name is written in the book of life, but “forasmuch as after this life there is an account to be given unto the righteous Judge, by whom all must be judged without respect of persons, to examine himself and his estate

“ both towards God and man, so that accus-  
 “ ing and condemning himself for his own  
 “ faults he may find mercy at our heavenly  
 “ Father’s hand for Christ’s sake, and not be  
 “ accused, and condemned in that fearful  
 “ judgment.” Indeed through every part both  
 of our Homilies and Liturgy the necessity of  
 something more is enforced than a bare persua-  
 sion of faith: but no where with more perspi-  
 cuity and energy, than in the following passage.  
 “ Wherefore, it is said, as you have any zeal  
 “ for the right and pure honouring of God,  
 “ as you have any regard to your own souls,  
 “ and to the life that is to come, which is  
 “ both without pain and without end, apply  
 “ yourselves chiefly above all things to read  
 “ and hear God’s word, mark diligently  
 “ therein what his will is that you shall do,  
 “ and with all your endeavour apply your-  
 “ selves to follow the same.” (19)

To conclude, from a retrospect of the whole  
 it appears, that the great point in dispute  
 was this: Whether he who sincerely repents  
 of his past transgressions should trust (for as-  
 sistance must be somewhere placed) in the ef-  
 ficacy of his own merits, or in that of his  
 Redeemer’s. But while our Reformers, like  
 the Lutherans, pertinaciously contended for  
 an assistance of the latter description, they  
 never

never dreamed of imputing to it any mysterious operation, or of investing it with a higher character of certainty, than what it derives from the stable foundation, upon which it rests. Without reserve or hesitation they declared, that he, who contemplates it as an act of the mind in itself capable of justifying him, disregarding all internal change of disposition, and external emendation of life, only trifles with God, and deceives himself<sup>(20)</sup>. Repentance and amendment they inculcated as no less necessary to a state of acceptance, than faith, not indeed as meritorious, but as requisite conditions, as conditions, without which it is neither to be obtained nor preserved. Never therefore should it be forgotten, that when they spoke of justification by faith alone, they solely opposed the scholastical system, so frequently alluded to, which attributed to our merits the expiation of crime, and a readmission into the favour of God; this, with an inflexibility not greater than the occasion demanded, they constantly laboured to annihilate, and to restore in its stead the plain doctrine of a perfect propitiation and satisfaction for sin by the death of Christ: a doctrine which had been lost to the world during centuries of intellectual darkness, and with which had disappeared

K 4

peared the genuine splendour of Christianity. But, although a long and gloomy night succeeded, the Day Spring from on high at length returned; when Reformation approached, the dawn again began to break, and the Day Star arose in the penitential heart, diffusing around it consolation and joy.

---

## S E R M O N VII.

I PETER i. 2.

*Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father.*

THE doctrine of Predestination, the last subject which I proposed to consider, has been so frequently involved in metaphysical obscurity, and disgraced by enthusiastical conceit, that men of moderate principles have been averse from admitting it in any sense. Yet even in its harshest construction we cannot deny, that it has sometimes found advocates among writers of worth and talent, although it has been thus generally supported by those, who possessed more vanity than piety, and zeal than ability. This, above all other controversies, has contributed to augment the scorn of Infidels, to dissolve the bonds of Christian charity, and obliterate the characteristical simplicity of Gospel redemption. While the wise have been perplexed by the turn, which its discussions have occasionally taken, the weak have been alarmed, and the feelings even of the good, lost in  
its

its circuitous mazes, almost excited to despair.

The unfathomable depths of divine Pre-science and Predetermination, human reason in vain attempts to sound; finite faculties to scan infinite; the limited intellect of man to comprehend the immensity of the Godhead. Erasmus, a peculiar favourite with the Reformers of our own country, when contemplating this inexplicable subject, observed, that in the holy Scriptures there are certain secret recesses, which God is unwilling for us too minutely to explore, and which if we endeavour to explore, in proportion as we penetrate further and further, our minds become more and more oppressed with darkness and stupefaction, that thus we might acknowledge the inscrutable majesty of the divine wisdom, and the imbecillity of the human mind (<sup>1</sup>). Congenial also with the feelings and sentiments of Erasmus upon this point, were those of Luther. To acquire any knowledge, he remarked, of a Deity not revealed in Scripture, to know what his existence is, his actions, and dispositions, belongs not to me; my duty is only this; to know what are his precepts, his promises, and his threatenings. Pernicious and pestilent is the thought of investigating causes,  
and



and brings with it inevitable ruin, especially when we ascend too high, and wish to philosophize upon Predestination (<sup>2</sup>).

How differently Calvin felt upon the same subject, and with what little reserve, or rather with what bold temerity, he laboured to scrutinize the unrevealed Divinity, is too well known, to require any thing beyond a bare allusion to the circumstance. His sentiments however, as on a former occasion I noticed, were much less regarded by our Reformers, than some are disposed to allow; and upon the particular question before us, so far were they from having attained their full celebrity at the period under consideration, that they were not taught without opposition, even in his own unimportant territory of Geneva. For at that precise æra he was publicly accused of making God the author of sin; and although, not contented with silencing, he first imprisoned, and afterwards banished, his accuser, yet he could not expel the opinions of his adversary (<sup>3</sup>).

Turning then from the devious track which he was pursuing, our Reformers, as generally on other occasions, trod in the wary steps of the Lutherans, who, while the Church of Rome maintained a predestination to life of one man in preference to another indi-

individually, on account of personal merit, taught on the other hand a gratuitous predestination of Christians collectively, of those, whom God has chosen in Christ out of mankind; and by this single point of difference were the contending opinions principally contradistinguished.

My object in the present Lecture will be, to point out the Scholastical and Lutheran sentiments upon this much agitated question, reserving those of our own Church for a future consideration.

With us the system of Calvin for so long a period superseded every other, and even still retains so many zealous advocates, that to a modern ear the very term Predestination seems to convey a meaning only conformable with his particular system. It should however be observed, that the word was in familiar use for centuries before the Reformation, in a sense very different from what he imputed to it, not as preceding the divine prescience, but as resulting from it, much in the same sense as that in which it has since been supported by the Arminians. Yet obvious as this appears, writers of respectability strangely persuade themselves, that immediately prior to the Reformation the doctrines of the Church of Rome were  
completely

completely Calvinistical ; a conclusion, to which certainly none can subscribe, who are sufficiently conversant with the favourite productions of the time ; who possess enough of fortitude to encounter the barbarisms of scholastical argument, and of patience to investigate its real object. So far indeed was this from being the fact, that Calvin peculiarly prided himself in departing from the common definition of the term, which had long been adopted by the adherents of the Schools, and retained with a scrupulous precision. For while they held, that the expression *prædestinati* is exclusively applicable to the elect, whom God, foreknowing as meritorious objects of his mercy, predestinates to life ; and appropriated that of *præsciti* to the non-elect, whose perseverance in transgression is simply foreknown, he, on the other side, treating the distinction as a frivolous subterfuge, contended, that God, decreeing the final doom of the elect and non-elect irrespectively, predestinates both, not subsequently, but previously to all foreknowledge of their individual dispositions, especially devotes the latter to destruction through the medium of crime, and creates them by a fatal destiny to perish (<sup>4</sup>). Whatsoever therefore

fore modern conjecture may have attributed to the Scholastics, it is certain, that, abhorring every speculation, which tends in the remotest degree to make God the author of sin, they believed, that only salutary good is predestinated ; grace to those, who deserve it congruously, and glory to those, who deserve it condignly <sup>(5)</sup>.

But to enter more particularly into their leading opinions upon this subject, they maintained, that Almighty God, before the foundations of the world were laid, surveying in his comprehensive idea, or, as they phrased it, in his Prescience of simple intelligence, the possibilities of all things, before he determined their actual existence, foresaw that if mankind were created, although he willed the salvation of all, and was inclined to assist all indifferently, yet that some would deserve eternal happiness, and others eternal misery ; and that therefore he approved and elected the former, but disapproved or reprobated the latter. Thus grounding election upon foreknowledge, they contemplated it, not as an arbitrary principle, separating one individual from another, under the influence of a blind chance, or an irrational caprice ; but, on the contrary, as a wise and just one, which

which presupposes a diversity of nature between those who are accepted, and those who are rejected (<sup>6</sup>).

Persuaded then that God is the fountain of all good, that from his divine preordination freely flows the stream of grace, which refreshes and invigorates the soul, they believed, that he has regulated his predetermination by the quality of the soil through which his grace passes, and the effects which in every case it produces, not restricting his favours, but distributing them with an impartial hand over the barren desert and the fruitful field; equally disposed towards all men, but, because all are not equally disposed towards him, distinguishing only such as prove deserving of his bounty. Although no adequate cause indeed exists, (according to the strict and accurate meaning of that expression,) why God should confer his gifts even upon the best of men, except in the plenitude of divine munificence, yet they conceived, that a sufficient reason was to be assigned, why he should communicate them rather to this man than to that, why he should elect the good; and reject the bad.

Hence it was, that in order to systematize upon this principle of election, and shew how consistent it is, as well with the justice,

as the benevolence of the Deity, the will of God was considered in a double point of view, as absolute and conditional, or, in the technical language of the Schools, as antecedent and consequent. In the first instance, by his absolute or antecedent will, he was said to desire the salvation of every man; in the latter, by his conditional or consequent will, that only of those, whom he foresaw abstaining from sin, and obeying his commandments; the one expressed his general inclination, the other his particular resolution, upon the view of individual circumstances and conditions (<sup>7</sup>). To the enquiry, why some are unendowed with grace, their answer was, because some are not willing to receive it, and not because God is unwilling to give it: he, they said, offers his light to all: he is absent from none, but man absents himself from the present Deity, like one who shuts his eyes against the noon-day blaze (<sup>8</sup>).

To the foregoing statement it should be added, that they held an election, or rather an ordination, to grace (which they expressly asserted to be defectible) distinct from an election to glory; that, according to them, a name may be written in the book of life at one period, which at another may be erased from it; and that predestination to eternal  
happi-

happinefs solely depends upon final perfeverance in well doing (<sup>9</sup>).

On the whole it is evident, that they confidered the dignity of the individual as the meritorious basis of predeftination; merit of congruity as the basis of a preordination to grace; and merit of condignity as that of a preordination to glory (<sup>10</sup>). Thus, not more faftidious in the choice of their terms, than accurate in the ufe of them, while they denied, that the prefciences of human virtue, correctly fpeaking, could be the primary caufe of the divine will, becaufe nothing in time can properly give birth to that, which has exifted from eternity, they ftrenuoufly maintained it to be a fecondary caufe, the ratio or rule in the mind of the Deity, which regulated his will in the formation of its ultimate decifions (<sup>11</sup>).

To enter more minutely into the detail of fcholaftical difquifition upon this topic, appears unneceffary, at leaft to the illuftration of any opinions entertained by the Lutherans, whole peculiar tenets I proceed in the next place to confider.

It fhould previously however be obferved, that, although in the eftablifhed Confeflion of their faith all allufion to the fubject was avoided, it was nevertheless introduced into

another work of importance, and of considerable public authority, the *Loci Theologici* of Melancthon, a production, which, at the period under review, was every where received as the standard of Lutheran divinity (<sup>12</sup>). Both Luther and Melancthon, after their creed became permanently settled at the diet of Augsbourg, kept one object constantly in view ; to inculcate only what was plain and practical, and never to attempt philosophizing. They perceived, that before the Reformation the doctrine of divine foreknowledge had been grossly misconceived and abused, although guarded by all the logic of the Schools ; and they felt, that, after it, they had themselves at first contributed to increase the evil, by grounding upon the same high argument, although for a very different purpose, the position of an infallible necessity ; and thenceforward, therefore, they only taught a predestination, which the Christian religion explains, and the Christian life exemplifies.

But to what, it may be said, did the Lutherans object in the theory of their opponents, when they abandoned the tenet of necessity ? Certainly not to the sobriety and moderation of that part of it, which vindicated the justice, and displayed the benevolence,



lence, of the Almighty; but generally to the principles upon which it proceeded; to its presumption, in overleaping the boundary, which Heaven has prescribed to our limited faculties, and which we cannot pass without plunging into darkness and error; and to its impiety, in disregarding, if not despising, the most important truths of Christianity. A system of such a nature they hesitated not to reject, anxious to conduct themselves by the light of Scripture alone, nor presuming to be wise above what God has been pleased to discover. Thus while their adversaries philosophized upon a predestination of individuals, preferred one before another by divine regard, because worthy of such a preference, they taught only that, which has been revealed with certainty, the predestination of a peculiar description of persons, "of a people zealous of good works," of the Christian Church contemplated as an aggregate, not on account of its own dignity, but on account of Christ its supreme Head, and the Author of eternal salvation, to all who obey him. Maintaining, not a particular election of personal favourites, either by an absolute will, or even a conditional one, dependent upon the ratio of merit, but a general election of all, who by baptism in

their infancy, or by faith and obedience in maturer years, become the adopted heirs of heaven; they conceived this to be the only election, to which the Gospel alludes, and consequently the only one, upon which we can speak with confidence, or reason without presumption (<sup>13</sup>).

If it be observed, that the selection of an integral body necessarily infers that of its component parts, the answer is obvious; the latter, although indeed it be necessarily inferred by the former, is nevertheless not a prior requisite, but a posterior result of the divine ordination. What they deemed absolute on the part of God, was his everlasting purpose to save his elect in Christ, or real Christians, considered as a whole, and contrasted with the remainder of the human race; the completion of this purpose being regulated by peculiar circumstances, operating as inferior causes of a particular segregation. For, persuaded of his good will towards all men without distinction, of his being indiscriminately disposed to promote the salvation of all, and of his seriously, not fictitiously, as Calvin taught, including all in the universal promise of Christianity, they imputed to him nothing like a partial choice, no limitation of favours, nor irrespective exclusion

clusion of persons ; but, assuming the Christian character as the sole ground of individual preference, they believed that every baptized infant, by being made a member of Christ, not by being comprised in a previous arbitrary decree, is truly the elect of God, and, dying in infancy, certain of eternal happiness ; that he, who in maturer years becomes polluted by wilful crime, loses that state of salvation, which before he possessed ; that nevertheless by true repentance, and conversion to the Father of mercy and God of all consolation, he is again reinstated in it ; and that, by finally persevering in it, he at length receives the kingdom prepared for every sincere Christian before the foundation of the world (<sup>14</sup>). Can any man, whom prejudice has not blinded, rank these sentiments with those of Calvin ?

While restoring to the doctrine of predestination, perplexed and disfigured by the vanity of the Schools, scriptural simplicity, they studiously and anxiously preserved every trace of that universal benevolence, by which Christianity is peculiarly distinguished. Let us, they said, with both our hands, or rather with all our heart, hold fast the true and pious maxim, that God is not the author of sin ; that he sits not in heaven, writing Stoical

laws in the volumes of fate ; but, endowed with a perfect freedom himself, communicates a liberty of action to his creatures ; firmly opposing the position of necessity as false, and pernicious to morals and religion. God, we may be assured, is no cruel and merciless tyrant ; he does not hate and reject men, but loves them, as a parent loves his children (<sup>15</sup>).

Universal grace, indeed, was at all times a favourite topic with the Lutherans ; nor would they admit of any predestination, except that of a beneficent Deity, who was in Christ reconciling the world to himself ; except a predestination, conformable with that order of things, which he has established, and with the use, or abuse, of the means, which he has ordained. The Almighty, they said, has seriously willed and decreed, from eternity, all men to be saved, and to enjoy everlasting felicity ; let us not therefore indulge in evil suggestions, and separate ourselves from his grace, which is as expanded as the space between heaven and earth ; let us not restrain the general promise, in which he offers his favour to all without discrimination, nor confine it to those, who, affecting a peculiar garb, wish to be alone esteemed pious and sanctified. If many perish, the  
fault

fault is not to be imputed to the divine will, but to human obstinacy, which despises that will, and disregards a salvation destined for all men (<sup>16</sup>). And because many are called, but few are chosen, let us not, they added, entertain an opinion highly impious, that God tenders his grace to many, but communicates it only to a few ; for should we not in the greatest degree detest a Deity, by whose arbitrary will we believed ourselves to be precluded from salvation ? (<sup>17</sup>) *Leon demand, punishment*

Upon the important point likewise of the conditional acceptance of the individual, their ideas were not more distinct, than their language was explicit. If God chose, they argued, certain persons only, in order to unite them to himself, and rejected the remainder in all respects alike, would not such an election without causes seem tyrannical ? Let us therefore be persuaded, that some cause exists in us, as some difference is to be found between those who are, and those who are not, accepted (<sup>18</sup>). Thus they conceived that, predestinating his elect in Christ, or the Christian Church, to eternal salvation, he excludes none from that number by a partial adoption of favourites, but calls all equally, and accepts of all, who obey his calling, or in other words, become true Christians, by possessing

the qualifications, which Christianity requires.

After what has been observed, it may seem perhaps almost unnecessary to subjoin, that they held the Defectibility of grace, its Indefectibility being a position supported but by those, who think, that the Redeemer died for a selected few alone. He, they stated, who falls from grace, cannot but perish, completely losing remission of sin, with the other benefits which Christ has purchased for him, and acquiring in their stead divine wrath and death eternal<sup>(19)</sup>. Let us execrate, said Melancthon, who, it should be remarked, in his private correspondence expressly termed Calvin the Zeno of his day<sup>(20)</sup>; let us execrate the Stoical disputations which some introduce, who imagine, that the elect always retain the Holy Spirit, even when they commit atrocious crimes; a manifest and highly reprehensible error; and let us not confirm in fools security and blindness<sup>(21)</sup>.

Upon the whole then it appears, that the Lutherans, affecting not in any way to philosophize, but committing themselves solely to the guidance of Scripture, differed from the Church of Rome in several important particulars. For although on some points they coincided with her, although they inculcated

cated with equal zeal, and upon a better principle, both the Universality and Defectibility of grace, as well as a conditional admission into the number of the elect, they nevertheless were entirely at variance with her upon the very foundation of the system. Thus while their opponents taught, that predestination consists in the prospective discrimination of individuals by divine favour, according to the foreseen ratio of every man's own merit, works of congruity deserving grace here, and works of condignity eternal life hereafter, and that in this way it principally rests upon human worth, they, on the other side, disclaiming every idea of such a discrimination, placed it upon the same basis as they assumed in the case of justification, that of an effectual redemption by Christ (<sup>22</sup>). Instead therefore of holding the election of individuals as men, on account of personal dignity, they maintained the election of a general mass, as Christians, on account of Christ alone; adding, that we are admitted into that number, or discarded from it, in the eye of Heaven, proportionably as we embrace or reject the salvation offered to all, embracing it with a faith inseparable from genuine virtue, or rejecting it by incredulity and crime. For neither in this, nor in the instance of justification,

cation,

cation, did they exclude repentance and a true conversion of the heart and life, as necessary requisites, but only as meritorious causes, from the contemplation of God's omniscient intellect. Let those, said Luther, who wish to be elected, avoid an evil conscience, and not transgress the divine commandments (<sup>23</sup>). Instructed then by the unerring page of truth, they asserted no other predestination, except what is there expressly revealed; that of the good and gracious Father of mankind, who from eternity has been disposed to promote the happiness and welfare of all men, has destined Christ to be the Saviour of the whole world, and withholden from none the exalted hope of the Christian calling. Convinced that this is the only predestination which Christianity discloses, and consequently the only one which we can either with safety or certainty embrace, they discouraged every attempt at investigating the will, out of the word, of God; every attempt at effecting impossibilities, at unveiling the secret counsels of him, who shrouds his divine perfections in darkness, impervious to mortal eyes. With such investigations, indeed, the world had already been sufficiently bewildered by the Scholastics, who, endowed with a ready talent at perplexing what  
what



what before was plain, and at rendering abstruseness still more abstruse, had made the subject totally inexplicable, vainly labouring to develop with precision that mysterious will, upon which the wise must ever think it folly, and the good impiety, to speculate.

I shall conclude with the memorable sentiments of Luther upon disquisitions of this presumptuous nature, which, from a personal experience of their mischievous tendency, he abjured himself, and deprecated in others. Are we, miserable men, he exclaimed, who as yet are incapable of comprehending the rays of God's promises, the glimmerings of his precepts and his works, although confirmed by words and miracles, are we, infirm and impure, eager to comprehend all, that is great and glorious in the Solar light itself, in the incomprehensible light of a miraculous Godhead? Do we not know, that God dwells in splendour inaccessible? And yet do we approach, or rather do we presume to approach it? Are we not aware, that his judgments are inscrutable? And yet do we endeavour to scrutinize them? And these things we do, before we are habituated even to the faint lustre of his promises and precepts, with a vision still imperfect, blindly rushing into the majesty of that light, which,  
secret

secret and unseen, has never been by words or miracles exhibited. What wonder then, if, while we explore its majesty, we are overwhelmed with glory ! (<sup>24</sup>)

S E R M O N VIII.

EPHES. i. 5.

*Having predestinated us to the adoption of children by  
Jesus Christ.*

THE doctrine of Predestination, according to the system adopted by the Lutherans, the outline of which on a former occasion I endeavoured to trace, was never intended to excite enthusiasm, or encourage presumption, but rather to administer solid consolation to pious and reflecting minds. Thus, they said, amidst the mutabilities of all things temporal, the subversions of ecclesiastical establishments, and the ruins of empires, we may with comfort and confidence assert, that God has predestinated the perpetual existence of a Church, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail; of a Church, which, founded upon the rock of his promise, can never fall, so that in vain the rains come, and the floods descend, and the tempests beat against it (1).

While maintaining therefore the election-  
of

of a collective mass on account of Christ, and not that of each separate individual on account of his own merits, they at the same time inculcated the important truth, that Almighty God is no respecter of persons, no capricious tyrant (<sup>2</sup>), but just and equitable in his proceedings; that he has sent his Son to be the Saviour of the whole world; and has in consequence predestinated to the adoption of children those, who duly receive and apply the means of salvation, which he has thus gratuitously provided for them, excluding none from his affections, except such as exclude themselves. Nor should it, they thought, be esteemed a point of indifference to be persuaded of his good will towards us as men, and to be assured of it as Christians, as well as to be convinced of possessing a certain title to everlasting happiness; “to  
“an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled,  
“and that fadeth not away, reserved for us  
“in heaven,” of which nothing but our own contumacy in crime can deprive us.

But the sentiments of the Lutherans on this head I have already sufficiently detailed. I proceed, therefore, in the last place, to consider what our own Church has established in her Article upon the same subject; a subject, perplexing only by being contemplated

plated as Calvin contemplated it, who, with all the confidence of the Schools, and the vanity of his country, endeavoured to explain that, which his better judgment should have told him was inexplicable. So far indeed is the Article in question from sanctioning the creed of the French Reformer, that, like those already reviewed, it seems to have been framed in perfect conformity with the less abstruse, and more scriptural, opinions of the Lutherans. With them it teaches an election of Christians out of the human race, conceives abundant consolation derivable from such an election, when piously surveyed, and not perverted by a profligate fatalism; and, lastly, represents its position upon the point as consistent with God's universal promises and revealed will, expressly declared to us in the holy Scriptures.

But in order accurately to comprehend its scope, it will be requisite to examine it more minutely.

“ Predestination to life” it defines to be  
“ the everlasting purpose of God, whereby,  
“ before the foundations of the world were  
“ laid, he hath constantly decreed, by his  
“ counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse  
“ and damnation those, whom he hath  
“ chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to  
“ bring

“ bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour.” The tendency and propriety of the leading terms adopted in this definition, we immediately perceive, when we recollect the system of the Scholastics, to which it was opposed. They believed predestination to be God’s everlasting purpose to confer grace and glory upon individuals, who deserve the first congruously, and the latter condignly ; conceiving us competent by our own virtues to extricate ourselves from crime, and its alarming consequences. Our Church, on the other hand, always keeping the idea of redemption in view, states it to be the everlasting purpose of the Almighty, to deliver from a state of malediction and destruction, (“ a maledictio  
“ et exitio liberare,”) from a guilt, which none can themselves obliterate ; and to render eternally happy, through Christ, or Christianity, as vessels before dishonourable thus formed to honour, those, whom he has elected not as meritorious individuals separately, but as a certain class of persons, as Christians collectively, “ whom he has chosen in Christ  
“ out of mankind.”

After having explained the nature, and slightly alluded to the objects, of that predestination, which alone it inculcates, the

Article

Article proceeds to enlarge upon the latter point, and to specify the peculiar characteristics of this highly favoured community. "Wherefore," it is added, "they which be  
"endued with so excellent a benefit of God,  
"be called according to his purpose, by his  
"Spirit working in due season," *Spiritu ejus opportuno tempore operante*; by his Spirit operating, not irresistibly at pleasure, without regard to time and circumstances, but conformably with the established constitution of human nature, at a seasonable period, when the mind is indisposed to resistance, or, as in infancy, incapable of it <sup>(3)</sup>; "they through  
"grace obey the calling, they are justified  
"freely;" are justified without any expiation or satisfaction for sin on their part, Christ himself only being the meritorious cause of it; "they are made the children of  
"God by adoption; they walk religiously in  
"good works; and at length by God's mercy," not by condign merit, "attain everlasting felicity." Such is the description given of those, who are predestinated to life; a description, which, when connected with the preceding clause, manifestly points out the election of a part out of the whole, yet not, according to the tenet of the Romish Church, the election of men preferred one

before another on account of their personal qualities, but of Christians, distinguished as an aggregate from the remainder of the human race, by a characteristical discrimination, by being called, justified, and sanctified, through Christianity.

The definition of the doctrine being completed, the subsequent passage, still carrying on the contrast with the Church of Rome, touches, in guarded but not ambiguous language, upon the application of it. “As the  
 “godly consideration,” it remarks, “of pre-  
 “destination and our election in Christ,” of the election of us Christians, “is full of  
 “sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort  
 “to godly persons, and such as feel in them-  
 “selves the working of the Spirit of Christ,” *vim Spiritus Christi*; the influence of that holy Spirit, of which the Gospel speaks, and not of that meritorious principle, which the Schools termed Charity, “mortifying the  
 “works of the flesh, and drawing up the  
 “mind to high and heavenly things, as well  
 “because it greatly establishes and confirms  
 “our faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed  
 “through Christ,” *fidem nostram de æterna salute consequenda per Christum*, our confidence in Christian salvation generally, and not theirs particularly, a change of the pro-  
 noun



noun adopted in the Látin not without design, “as because it fervently kindles our  
“love towards God, so for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to  
“have continually before their eyes the sentence of God’s predestination,” to believe, that God has predetermined something certain respecting their final doom, “is a most  
“dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil  
“doth thrust them into desperation, or into  
“wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less  
“perilous than desperation.” In this important clause we are taught, that none except the truly pious can derive consolation from the doctrine of our election in Christ, of *ours* collectively in a religious, and not of *theirs* individually in a personal, capacity; and that the opposite idea of a predestination which regards the persons of men, fixing the fate of each irrevocably, when entertained by those, whose curiosity and crime exceed their piety, tends to drive them into despair, from a persuasion of their being exposed to the wrath of heaven, as the non-elect, or from a presumption of their ultimate security, as the elect, into the most abandoned profligacy (<sup>4</sup>).

But the conclusion of the Article, as distinctly expressive of the basis, upon which the doctrine is founded, and admirably cal-

culated to prevent every misapplication of it, is worthy of particular observation. “ Furthermore,” it is said, “ we must receive God’s promises in such wise as they are generally set forth to us in holy Scripture, and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the word of God.” When we consider the preceding parts of the Article, the connexion of the whole, and the sentiments of the Lutherans, whose very style upon the subject seems particularly attended to, is it possible for a moment to imagine, (according to the conception of some,) that the object of this clause is to admit an absolute predestination in theory, but to proscribe it in practice? So far indeed from adopting such a conclusion, we ought rather to be persuaded, that the obvious tendency of it is very different; and that, instead of allowing in one sense, what it disallows in another, it rejects the same in both. For, assuming God’s universal promises as the ground-work of Predestination, it requires us to embrace them, not as confined to certain favourites previously ordained to bliss, but as general to the whole human species, to whom our Church elsewhere considers eternal life as offered without discrimination <sup>(5)</sup>,  
and

and not to indulge every evil propensity of our nature, under the pretence of being over-ruled by a secret will of Heaven, which we can neither promote nor resist; but to act in conformity with that will, which is clearly revealed to us in holy Scripture; a disposition in the common Parent of all men to effect the salvation of all, who obstruct not his operations on their part, discarding “the means of grace, and the hope of glory.” That the Lutherans perpetually urged the universality of the divine promises and will, I have already pointed out; and it should be remarked, that our Reformers on this occasion kept an eye even upon the language, as well as opinions, of Melancthon (<sup>6</sup>). Had they been inclined to favour the tenet of Calvin, we may be assured, that they would not have countenanced an idea, which gave particular offence to that Reformer, which he never alluded to, unless to explain it away, and which he prided himself upon having refuted, as an error. “*Aliquid differui,*” he remarks in his Institute, “*eorum errorem refellens, quibus generalitas promissionum videtur æquare totum humanum genus.*” Lib. iii. cap. 24. §. 1. What was the utmost latitude of expression upon the subject, which, had they been

his disciples, they would have admitted, we may learn from the Helvetic Confession, which speaks indeed of God's promises being universal, but, instead of extending that universality to all, restricts it to the faithful, "*Promissiones Dei sunt universales fidelibus.*" (7)

Having considered the whole of the Article, in a point of view, which no less exhibits the moderation of our Church, than her wisdom and piety, I shall simply refer, in confirmation of what has been advanced, to our baptismal service, which every where proceeds upon the principles suggested. There we are directly taught the benignity of our gracious Creator towards us all, without distinction, his election of us as Christians, and his subsequent rejection only of those, who, polluted by vice, divest themselves of that sacred character. So strikingly prominent indeed are these sentiments in the office alluded to, that in order not to perceive them, or to deny their existence, we must shut our eyes against the obvious construction of the English language. It expressly asserts, that the good will of our heavenly Father is equal towards all, who are brought to his holy baptism, that he favourably receives them, and embraces them with the arms  
of

of his mercy, gives unto them the blessing of eternal life, and makes them partakers of his everlasting kingdom <sup>(8)</sup>. But, lest even this should be deemed equivocal, or at least not sufficiently declarative of the object in view, the baptized are further said not only to be regenerated with his holy Spirit, and made his own children by adoption, but, still more explicitly, to be admitted “into  
“ the number of the children of God, and  
“ heirs of everlasting life.” <sup>(9)</sup> Was it possible for words more precise, distinct, and expressive, to be adopted? And yet there are writers who contend, that all infants are not supposed to be thus regenerated, and numbered among the elect of God, but only a fortunate few, irrespectively chosen, regeneration not always taking place in point of fact, but only in the judgment of charity; and that the words, upon which so much stress is laid, are only general expressions adapted to general forms. But those, who advance this argument in opposition to the plain import of the terms in contemplation, forget, or perhaps do not know, that we find no such general expressions, no such charitable judgment in the formulary of baptism drawn up and used by Calvin <sup>(10)</sup>; and that the office of our own Church is principally borrowed from

that of the Lutherans (<sup>11</sup>), whose well known sentiments on the subject it is unnecessary to repeat. They likewise forget a passage apparently decisive of the question, subjoined in the Rubric, which declares it to be certain, that baptized children, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved (<sup>12</sup>); a declaration which would be useless and absurd, if it could be so interpreted as to mean those alone, who are included in an absolute, and to us inscrutable, decree of predestination. Let us not however hence imagine, that our Reformers intended to establish any opinion inconsistent with the salvation of infants unbaptized. On the contrary, no less here, than upon an occasion formerly alluded to, the very reverse appears to have been the fact. For it should be observed, that the passage before us is not original, but borrowed from a work of popular instruction, composed in the reign of Henry, which, after stating, that by this Sacrament we are made the very sons of God, adds, “ Inſomuch that infants and children, dying  
“ in their infancy, ſhall undoubtedly be ſaved  
“ thereby, and elſe not.” (<sup>13</sup>) Now, while the omiſſion of the latter part of the clauſe in our Liturgy evidently points out the improvement in the creed of our Reformers,  
the

the insertion of the short sentence prefixed, "it is certain by God's word," seems no less convincingly to prove, that they speak only of that, which the lips of truth have revealed, and placed beyond conjecture, the covenanted mercy of Almighty God.

On the whole, by explaining this Article in conformity with our baptismal service, we instantly perceive, upon what principles divine election is supposed to proceed, and what is that general promise and will of God, of which it speaks, as expressly declared in the word of God; we perceive, that grace, according to the Lutheran doctrine, is directly taught to be both Universal and Defectible (<sup>14</sup>), circumstances, which necessarily preclude every idea of an arbitrary selection of individuals. Our benevolent Creator, we are told, possesses no private partiality for certain preordained objects of his bounty, but is equally disposed to all, embraces all indiscriminately with the arms of his mercy, and receives all, when dedicated to him by baptism, into the number of his elect; and when, at any subsequent period of our existence, he withdraws from us the light of his heavenly countenance, the cause of that deplorable change is not imputable to him, but to us, who prove defective on our parts, forfeiting

feiting in maturer years our title to eternal happiness, and excluding ourselves from salvation. Thus, when captivated with the pleasures of the world, and subdued by its temptations, we cease “manfully to fight “under the banner of Christ,” we completely lose that state of security, in which we before were placed; for it is not sufficient to be once regenerated, and made the children of Heaven by adoption, unless we are daily renewed by the holy Spirit, which we can never be, while we despise his dominion, resist his influence, and pollute the hallowed sanctuary, which he has established in our hearts. Hence therefore, from this diversity in us, (some finally abandoning the hope of their calling, and perishing in their crimes, others by repentance and amendment recovering it,) arises the rule of a personal discrimination in the mind of God; for although his purpose is indeed immutable, and his predestination of the elect, as a collective body, consequently absolute, yet our continuation in that number, or rejection from it, is evidently conditional, depending not upon his irrelative decree, but upon our Christian conduct, “upon our being endowed with heavenly virtues,” by which alone, through the merits and for the sake of Christ,



Christ, we are “everlastingly rewarded.”<sup>(15)</sup> And when we recollect, what our Church maintains in her Article of Free Will upon the point of human cooperation with divine agency, we see, that, according to her sentiments, widely differing from those of Calvin, in ourselves is to be found one essential requisite towards the performance of that condition, upon which, when erased by guilt, our names are again inscribed in the book of life.

In the preceding observations upon this Article, I have endeavoured to make our Church her own interpreter, and, omitting as unnecessary the elucidations, which might have been easily adduced from other parts of her Liturgy, confined myself to those, which her office of Baptism so appropriately and eminently affords<sup>(16)</sup>. The private sentiments of our Reformers on this occasion, it seems of little importance to ascertain, because, in truth, the question turns not upon what they privately and individually believed, but upon what they publicly and collectively taught; it may notwithstanding be satisfactory to know, that, as far as we are enabled to judge from their writings, they maintained nothing which invalidates, but rather much which confirms, what has been advanced<sup>(17)</sup>.

One

One of them indeed, who was the most copious and explicit upon the subject, has been given up by the Calvinists (if the anachronism be allowable) as a complete Arminian. But this concession proves more, than was perhaps intended by those who made it; it proves, that Arminianism and Lutheranism are precisely the same thing; for it is remarkable, that some of the passages, usually quoted from the works of Bishop Hooper, for the purpose under consideration, were literally translated from the *Loci Theologici* of Melancthon (<sup>18</sup>).

After having completed the illustration which I proposed, it only remains for me to restate, in few words, the various topics, which have been discussed. In adverting, however slightly, to each, we immediately perceive, that the leading object of our Reformers in every instance was to christianize the speculations of the Schools; to point out, as I have had frequent occasion to observe, the necessity and efficacy of redemption. According to the perverted theology of their opponents, by whom the oracles of divine truth were little studied, and less regarded, the corruption of our nature, as far at least as it relates to the mental faculties, was deemed wholly ideal; by congruous merit  
we

we were thought competent to obtain God's favour here, and by condign the fruition of his glorious Godhead hereafter ; while it was conceived, that on account of both we were predestined to salvation. Fascinated therefore by the potent magic of the Schools, when the soul of man surveyed her powers and her prospects, instead of viewing herself as a sinful and fallen creature, contaminated by original, and ruined, beyond all hope of human remedy, by actual depravity, she beheld herself transformed into an angel of light. Contemplating the approbation of Heaven, not as a boon to be supplicated, but as a reward to be deserved, she disdained to accept it gratuitously, but claimed it as the recompense of her virtues, and challenged it as her due. To her own merits she imputed her justification in this life, and her proud title to bliss in the life to come, unmindful of those, which the Christian ought alone to plead at the throne of mercy, and which by repentance and faith he makes his own. Nor did her complacency in her own good qualities and superior endowments rest even here. Arrayed in all the dignity of moral excellence, and the graces of genuine piety, she beheld herself eternally present to the eye of God, elected before others for her intrinsic

trinfic worth, and predestinated to everlasting felicity, becaufe deferving of it. Where, in fuch a fyftem, is to be found a place for the full, perfect, and fufficient oblation and fatisfaction of him, who came to feek and to fave that which was loft ?

On the other hand, when contrafted with the fcholaftical doctrine, in how advantageous a point of view, how much more confiftent with Gofpel truth, and declarative of Gofpel beneficence, appears that of the Church of England ! The ever-memorable Divines, who compiled her Offices, and reformed her Creed, inftead of exercifing their talents in abftrufe theory and vain speculation, directed their attention wholly to the word of God. Upon this grounding every pofition which they eftablifhed, they taught, with no lefs fimplicity than fincerity, that we poffefs by nature a tendency to evil, which in itfelf is no innocuous quality, but one offensive to a juft and holy God, when abftractedly confidered ; that we cannot ourfelves in any way atone for fin ; but that an atonement has been once made for all by the common Saviour of mankind ; and that confequently, inftead of attempting to expiate it by our own merits, whether congruous or condign, we ought rather, with a lively faith, united  
to

to a truly penitent and contrite heart, to trust in the expiation of Christ alone, because something more is requisite than we can perform, to appease the displeasure and satisfy the justice of Heaven. Thus while their adversaries laboured to promote pharisaical pride, and render the cross of Christ of no effect, they solely endeavoured to inculcate Christian humility, and to demonstrate the inestimable value of Christian redemption; not indeed in a Calvinistical sense, as if faith were appropriated to the elect only, for that would have been to exchange one species of personal conceit for another; but in a sense, which both Scripture and Reason approve, which makes the light of the evangelical as general in its influences, as that of the natural day. For upon the subject of Predestination, as well as upon every other, which has been alluded to, their prudence was not less conspicuous than their piety. Approaching it with reverence, and treating it with circumspection, they indulged not, like many in the Church of Rome, and like some who were enumerated among the friends of reformation, in abstruse disquisitions upon the nature of the divine will; they boasted not of a philosophy, which affected to soar above vulgar view, and fix its  
sub-

sublime abode in the bosom of God himself. That he, whom the wonders of created being perplex, who knows not half the wisdom of the meanest insect, that man, equally imperfect as impure, should presume to investigate the arcana of the omniscient mind, appeared to them the height of extravagance and crime. Their feelings recoiled at the idea of passing the boundary, which the Scriptures have prescribed, and of exploring without an infallible guide the abyss of the unrevealed Godhead; what no human intellect can comprehend, they were contented in silence to adore. Every attempt therefore to explain the will of the unknown God, as he exists in his native majesty, amid clouds of impenetrable darkness, they utterly disclaimed, and spoke only of that consolatory effect of it, which the sacred volumes disclose to us, and represent as certain, the predestination of Christians to eternal life. With this express object in view they intimately blended the doctrine of election with the holy ordinance of baptism, including all in the universal promise, and regulating the decrees of God by our assumption or rejection of the Christian character; persuaded that the contrary tenet of a predestination by individual destiny is attended with the worst

worst of consequences ; that while it furnishes the profligate sinner with a pretext for his vices, it increases the agony of the desponding, whose petitions for mercy and forgiveness seem never to reach the throne of grace, but return to his afflicted soul disregarded, if not despised ; adding tenfold horror to his despair.

To conclude, we perceive with much concern, and feel perhaps with some resentment, that upon the subjects, which have been considered in these Lectures, the creed of our Church has been often ignorantly misconceived, or maliciously misrepresented. Contemplated as the inflexible advocate of fatalism, by some she has been extravagantly applauded, and by others unreasonably traduced. The Socinian in particular has been often gratified in imputing to her obnoxious opinions, has sometimes added insult to injury, and, where her liberality should have been commended, has insidiously held up her supposed bigotry to public scorn and detestation. Let us not however, on this account, abandon her cause, or cease to vindicate her real sentiments, but rather persevere in our efforts with the firmness of men, and the temper of Christians, supported by the consoling assurance, that truth will not hang  
N for

for ever suspended between calumny and falsehood, but will at length assert its genuine character ; “ Non semper pendebit inter latrones Christus ; refurget aliquando crucifixæ Veritas.” (<sup>19</sup>)



## NOTES.



---

# NOTES

## ON SERMON I.

*Page 8, note (¹).*

THIS is sufficiently evinced by the well known attempts of the Calvinists, both in the reign of Elizabeth and James, to procure the insertion of the Lambeth Articles among the established Articles of our Church. Upon the accession of the latter Prince, a conference was publicly held at Hampton Court, in which the innovation alluded to, with others of equal importance, was suggested. The particulars of this conference were subsequently published, in which the spokesman of the Calvinists is stated to have moved his Majesty, "That the Book of Articles of Religion, concluded in 1562, might be explained in places obscure, and enlarged where some things were defective. For example, whereas Art. 16. the words are these, *After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace, notwithstanding the meaning be found, yet he desired, that, because they may seem to be contrary to the doctrine of God's Predestination and Election in the 17th Article, both these words might be explained with this or the like addition; yet neither totally nor finally; and also that the nine assertions orthodoxall, as he termed them, concluded upon at Lambeth, might be inserted into that book of Articles."* p. 24. To this conference James

himself alluded in his Proclamation for authorizing an uniformity of the Book of Common Prayer. “ At our  
“ very first entry (he remarked) into this realm, being  
“ entertained and importuned with informations of  
“ fundry ministers complaining of the errors and im-  
“ perfections of the Church here, as well *in matter of*  
“ *doctrine* as of discipline, although we had no reason  
“ to presume &c. . . . yet because the importunity of  
“ the complainers were great, their affirmations vehe-  
“ ment, and the zeal wherewith the same did seem to  
“ be accompanied very specious, we were moved  
“ thereby to make it our occasion to discharge that  
“ duty which is the chiefest of all kingly duties, that  
“ is, to settle the affairs of religion and the service of  
“ God before their own. Which while we were in  
“ hand to do, as the contagion of the sickness reign-  
“ ing in our city of London and other places would  
“ permit an assembly of persons meet for that pur-  
“ pose, some of those who misliked the state of reli-  
“ gion here established, presuming more of our in-  
“ tents, than ever we gave them cause to do, and  
“ transported with humour, began such proceedings,  
“ as did rather raise a scandal in the Church than take  
“ offence away. For both they used forms of public  
“ serving of God not here allowed, held assemblies with-  
“ out authority, and did other things carrying a very  
“ apparent shew of sedition, more than of zeal; whom  
“ we restrained by a former proclamation in the month  
“ of October last, and gave intimation of the conse-  
“ quence we intended to be had with as much speed as  
“ conveniently could be, for the ordering of those  
“ things of the Church, which accordingly followed  
“ in the month of January last, at our Honour of  
“ Hampton Court, where before ourself and our Privy  
“ Council were assembled many of the gravest Bishops  
“ and

“ and Prelates of the realms, and many other learned  
 “ men, as well of those, that are conformable to  
 “ the state of the Church established, as of those that  
 “ dissented. Among whom what our pains were,  
 “ what our patience in hearing and replying, and  
 “ what the indifference and uprightness of our judg-  
 “ ment in determining, we leave to the report of  
 “ those who heard the same, contenting ourself with  
 “ the sincerity of our own heart therein. But we  
 “ cannot conceal, that the success of that conference  
 “ was such, as happeneth to many other things,  
 “ which, moving great expectation before they be en-  
 “ tered into, in their issue produce small effects.”

The *nine assertions orthodoxal* referred to on this occasion, or the nine predestinarian propositions originally drawn up at Lambeth, in consequence of some public disputes at Cambridge, were the following ;

“ 1. Deus ab æterno prædestinavit quosdam ad vi-  
 “ tam, quosdam reprobavit ad mortem.

“ 2. Causa movens aut efficiens prædestinationis ad  
 “ vitam, non est prævisio fidei aut perseverantiæ, aut  
 “ bonorum operum, aut ullius rei quæ insit in personis  
 “ prædestinatis, sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei.

“ 3. Prædestinatorum præfinitus et certus est nume-  
 “ rus, qui nec augeri nec minui potest.

“ 4. Qui non sunt prædestinati ad salutem, necessa-  
 “ rio propter peccata sua damnabuntur.

“ 5. Vera, viva, et justificans fides, et Spiritus Dei  
 “ justificantis, non extinguitur, non excidit, non eva-  
 “ nescit, in electis aut finaliter aut totaliter.

“ 6. Homo vere fidelis, id est, fide justificante præ-  
 “ ditus, certus est plerophoria fidei de remissione pec-  
 “ catorum suorum, et salute sempiterna sua per Chris-  
 “ tum.

“ 7. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communica-  
 “ tur,

“tur, non conceditur universis hominibus, qua servari  
“possint, si velint.

“8. Nemo potest venire ad Christum, nisi datum  
“ei fuerit, et nisi pater eum traxerit, et omnes homi-  
“nes non trahuntur a patre, ut veniant ad filium.

“9. Non est positum in arbitrio aut potestate unius  
“cujusque homines servari.”

Although the Calvinists failed under James in their attempt to correct what they deemed to be “*the errors and imperfections of the Church, as well in matter of doctrine as discipline,*” nevertheless under his unhappy Successor, or rather under the authority of a Parliament in opposition to the Sovereign, they commenced an actual Reformation of our Articles. In the year 1643 “the Assembly of Divines,” as the Committee alluded to has been usually styled, revised the first fifteen, “with a design,” as the historian of the Puritans himself observes, “to render their sense more express, and determinate in favour of Calvinism.” Neal’s History of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 48. ed. 1754. The 9th Article of Original Sin was thus amended by them; “Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk, but [*together with his first sin imputed*] it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is propagated from Adam, whereby man is wholly deprived of (not as before, *very far gone from*) original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined [*only*] to evil . . . yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust is *truly and properly* sin” (instead of *both of itself the nature of sin.*) In the 10th Art. upon Free Will they made only one interpolation, but that of some importance. After the words, “without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will,” they inserted,

ferted, "*and working so effectually in us, as that it determineth our will to that which is good.*" And again in the 11th Art. upon Justification, another explanation of no less importance was introduced. "We are justified," it was said, "that is, we are accounted righteous before God, and have remission of sins not for nor by our own works or deservings, but freely by his grace, only for our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ's sake, *his whole-obedience and satisfaction being by God imputed unto us, and Christ with his righteousness being apprehended and rested on by faith only.*" Ibid. Appendix, No. 1. Do not these emendations prove, that the respective opinions introduced were not, in the judgment of those who proposed them, at least necessarily contained in the original Articles? An unprejudiced Calvinist might perhaps admit a stronger conclusion to be warrantable.

That the Assembly of Divines proceeded no further in their labours than to the review of the 15th Article, might be owing to a persuasion of the attempt being hopeless, from the incorrigibility of the ancient creed; or perhaps to a prospect, which then began rapidly to open upon the Puritanical cause, not merely of reforming the Church, but altogether of subverting it.

*Page 10, note (2).*

Ego persuasus sum sine literarum peritia prorsus stare non posse sinceram theologiam, sicut hactenus, ruentibus et jacentibus literis, miserrime et cecidit et jacuit. Quin video, nunquam fuisse insignem factam verbi Dei revelationem, nisi primo, velut percursoribus Baptistis, viam pararit surgentibus et florentibus linguis et literis. Lutheri Epistol. vol. ii. p. 307. Vitæ German. Theologorum a Melchione Adamo, p. 164.

*Page 11, note (3).*

"How not only *men of the new learning* (as they  
" be

“be called) but also the very Papistical authors  
 “do allow, &c.” Letter from Cranmer to Henry  
 VIII. Burnet’s History of the Reformation, vol. i.  
 Addenda, p. 319. “But when a good number of the  
 “best learned men reputed within this realm, some  
 “favouring the old, and some *the new learning*, as  
 “they term it, &c.” Cranmer’s Letter to Queen  
 Mary, Fox’s Martyrology, vol. ii. p. 1715. ed. 1610.

Page 12, note (\*).

After the commencement of our Reformation;  
 Melancthon was repeatedly pressed personally to assist  
 in completing it, both in Henry’s and Edward’s reign.  
 An invitation of this kind certainly took place so early  
 as March 1534; for in a letter of that date he thus ex-  
 presses himself; “Ego jam alteris literis in Angliam vo-  
 “cor.” Epist. p. 717. And again in the October of the  
 following year; “Ego rursus Anglicis non solum li-  
 “teris, sed etiam legationibus, et vocor et exerceor.”  
 Epist. Libri Londini, p. 732. lib. iv. epist. 179. The  
 cause however why he came not then, as at first  
 he intended, (for the Elector of Saxony had consented  
 to his journey, and Luther was anxious for it,) he ex-  
 plains in another letter to Camerarius; “Anglicæ pro-  
 “fectionis cura prorsus liberatus sum. Postquam enim  
 “tragici casus in Anglia acciderunt, magna consilio-  
 “rum mutatio secuta est. Posterior Regina (viz. Ann  
 “Boleyn) magis accusata, quam convicta, adulterii,  
 “ultimo supplicio affecta est.” Anno 1536. Epist. Libri  
 Lond. lib. iv. ep. 187. In 1538 he was a third time soli-  
 cited. Upon the return of Fred. Myconius, and the other  
 Germans, who had been sent hither by the Protestant  
 Princes of Germany, with the hope of obtaining Hen-  
 ry’s accession to their religious league, that monarch  
 wrote thus to the Elector of Saxony; “Mutuas vero  
 “has actiones nostras ubi vestra excellentia ex suis ora-  
 “toribus



"toribus penitus cognoverit, ipsi pro sua singulari pruden-  
 "dentia, et innato quodam connatus quosque optimos  
 "promovendi studio, quam maxime probatum iri non  
 "ambigimus; et pro his, quæ feliciter aperi cœpta  
 "sunt, felicius absolvendis concludendisque expecta-  
 "mus, ut Dominum Philippum Melancthonem, in cujus  
 "excellenti eruditione et sano judicio a bonis omnibus mul-  
 "ta spes reposita est, doctosque alios et probos viros,  
 "primo quoque tempore, ad nos mittat." Seckendorf,  
 Histor. Luther. lib. iii. §. 66. add. 1. The same wish  
 also on the part of Henry those Ambassadors noticed, in  
 the report of their proceedings here. "Mira," says  
 Seckendorf, "in illa (viz. relatione) narratur Regis  
 "humanitas, ut legatos, præsentibus aulæ proceribus,  
 "honorifice admiserit, amplexu suo dignatus sit, be-  
 "nigne audiverit, placidissime responderit, sæpe etiam  
 "*Melancthonis præsentiam desiderari à se testatus sit.*"  
 Ibid. Melancthon indeed was so much valued by  
 that Monarch, that Gardiner (who certainly more de-  
 served the appellation of Henricianus, than Cranmer,  
 to whom it has been insidiously applied) thought it  
 proper to profess the greatest regard for him. "How  
 "highly," said the latter to the former, in their con-  
 troversy upon the Eucharist, "you have esteemed Me-  
 "lancthon in times past, it is not unknown." Answer  
 to Gardiner, p. 138.

During the short reign of Edward, solicitations of a  
 similar nature appear to have been frequent. Latimer, in  
 a sermon preached before the King, March 22, 1549,  
 thus alludes to a report of the time: "I heard say mas-  
 "ter Melancthon, that great clerk, should come hither.  
 "I would wish him, and such as he is, to have two hun-  
 "dred pound a year. The King should never want it  
 "in his coffers at the year's end." Latimer's Sermons,  
 p. 47. In the subsequent year his presence here was a  
 second

second time requested. "Ego," he remarks in a letter to J. Camearius, "rursus in Angliam vocor." Epist. Londin. p. 915. lib. iv. epist. 780. anno 1550. May 17. And lastly, again immediately before the death of that much lamented Prince; "Regiis literis vocor in Angliam, quæ scriptæ sunt mense Maio. Postea secuta est mors nobilissimi adolescentis, qui etiam exemplum est humanæ imbecillitatis." J. Camerario, ibid. p. 930. lib. iv. epist. 813. anno 1553. The latter circumstance Strype notices in his Ecclesiastical Memorials; "Had not," he says, "the King died so soon, the moderate, learned, and wise Melancthon would have come into England, and been placed in the University of Cambridge. For in the month of May a letter in Latin was sent to him from the King, signifying, that the King had elected him to supply that place, which Martin Bucer, deceased, had in that University. And June 6 following, a warrant was issued to the Treasurer of the Augmentations, to deliver to the Archbishop of Canterbury 50 pounds, to be sent over the seas by him, for the expences of the same learned man coming to the King's presence." Vol. ii. p. 401.

If the reader compares the date of Melancthon's first invitation to England, with that of the publications in the following note, he will find, that it preceded every doctrinal reformation in this country. Nor perhaps is it too much to suppose, that the formularies of faith, which were promulged in the reign of Henry, originated in the advice of Melancthon, as contained in a letter to that Prince, dated March 3, 1535, and that they were formed, in part at least, upon his decisions of certain points committed to writing. "Nec vero dubito," remarks the Lutheran Reformer, "quin et ipsæ religionum controversiæ mitigarentur, si regia ma-

"jestas

“*jestas tua, cum auctoritatem suam conferret ad reges*  
 “*cæteros ad moderationem flectendos, tum vero cum*  
 “*doctis hominibus de genere doctrinæ deliberaret.* Nam et  
 “*illud minime obscurum est, in Ecclesiam abusus quos-*  
 “*dani non dissimulandos irrepsisse; neque tamen operam*  
 “*dare reges, ut extet aliqua simplex et certa doctrinæ*  
 “*forma. . . . D. Antonius*” (Dr. Barnes, afterwards a  
 Martyr, but at that time Henry’s Ambassador in Ger-  
 many) “*summa fide et diligentia de certis Articulis no-*  
 “*biscum disputavit, de quibus meum iudicium ipsi per-*  
 “*scriptum dedi.*” *Epistolæ Londin.* p. 11. In the very  
 next year certain Articles of Religion were drawn up  
 and edited in the King’s name, which were evidently  
 of a Lutheran tendency. Indeed the definition of  
 so interesting a topic as that of Justification was  
 evidently translated from the *Loci Theologici* of Me-  
 lancthon. “The word Justification,” it was said,  
 “signifieth remission of our sins, and our acceptation  
 “or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God.”  
 Melancthon’s words are; “*Justificatio significat re-*  
 “*missionem peccatorum, et reconciliationem, seu ac-*  
 “*ceptionem personæ ad vitam æternam.*” *Loci*  
*Theolog. de Gratia et Justific.*

*Page 14, note (5).*

The first public attempt at a reformation of opi-  
 nion was made in the year 1536, when a short code of  
 doctrine was published, under the title of “Articles  
 “devised by the King’s Highness Majesty, to stablish  
 “Christian quietness and unity among us, and to  
 “avoid contentious opinions, which Articles be also  
 “approved by the consent and determination of the  
 “whole clergy of this realm.”

In the subsequent year appeared a larger work of  
 religious instruction, commonly called “The Bishops’  
 “Book,” because it was principally composed by the  
 Bishops,

Bishops, although not without the assistance of other able Divines. This, which was denominated "The Institution of a Christian Man," contained an exposition of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Sacraments, the Ave Maria, Justification, and Purgatory. The two last, with the doctrine upon Baptism, Penitence, and the Eucharist, were taken word for word from the preceding Articles.

By some unaccountable mistake Collier states, that "this book was drawn up in a convocation three years before;" Eccles. History, vol. ii. p. 139. when the Articles above-mentioned, parts of which were introduced in it, were not in existence. While Collier blunders about its date, Strype misconceives the work altogether, imagining it to have been nothing more than the Articles themselves. In the first vol. of his Ecclesiastical Memorials, p. 381, he says, "The Institution is *reprinted* in the Addenda to the first vol. of the History of the Reformation." By referring to the page of Burnet, which he quotes, the Articles only are to be found. In fact, had Burnet ever seen the production, (which is very doubtful,) it would have been too voluminous for insertion.

Afterwards, in 1543, a similar performance came out with the royal sanction, under the title of "A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man;" and therefore usually termed the King's Book. It was confined to the same subjects as the foregoing, with the addition of some explanations upon the points of Faith, Free Will, and Good Works; and although not a mere revision of the "Institution," it nevertheless contained little more than the sentiments of that work (the doctrine of Transubstantiation alone excepted) differently, and perhaps something more sophistically, expressed.

Before

Before its publication it was approved by the Convocation then sitting, in which it was examined in parts, as appears evident from the minutes of that assembly, in Wilkins's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniae*, vol. iii. p. 868. Yet Burnet twice remarks, that it was never introduced there. See his *History of the Reformation*, vol. i. p. 286, and his *Supplement*, p. 159. This is the more remarkable, as he seems to have perused a copy of the authentic record of the transaction. *Supplement*, p. 161. But we cannot be surprised at any want of accuracy in this historian, when we read the following confession ; “ I did, in my second volume, publish a commission to Cromwell, thinking it “ was that, which constituted him the King’s vicegerent, which I, in reading the *beginning* of it, took to be “ so ; but *this was one of the effects of the haste, in which I “ wrote that work.*” This haste however is not only visible in the work itself, but in the *Supplement* to it. For unfortunately in the very instance under consideration, he observes, “ In the Convocation of the year “ 1543, we have only *this short word* ; that on the 29th “ of April the Archbishop treated of the Sacraments, “ and on the next day on the Article of Free Will. “ This is all that I could gather from the copy of the “ minutes of the Convocation.” p. 161. If the reader turns to the minutes alluded to, which are preserved in Wilkins, as above quoted, he will find, that something more than Burnet’s short word was recorded ; he will perceive, that on the 20th of April the Exposition of the Lord’s Prayer in English was considered ; on the 21st, that of the five first precepts of the Decalogue ; on the 24th and 25th, that of the remaining five, with another of the Sacraments, and not on the 29th, as Burnet states ; on the 27th, that of the word Faith, of the 12 Articles of Faith, of Justification, Works, and Prayer.

Prayer for the dead ; and on the 30th, that of the Article of Free Will. Upon which latter day the minute runs thus ; “ Quo die lectos et publice expositos  
 “ in vulgari Articulos liberi Arbitrii tradidit Reveren-  
 “ diffimus Prolocutori eo animo, ut ipse eundem trac-  
 “ tatum coram Prælatiſ inferioris Domus perlegeret.  
 “ Quem lectum reſtituerunt ſuperiori Domui cum hac  
 “ approbatione, quod pro catholicis et religioſis eos  
 “ acceptarunt, necnon gratias ingentes patribus ege-  
 “ runt, quod tantos labores, ſudores, et vigilias reli-  
 “ gionis et reipublicæ cauſa, et unitatis gratia, ſubie-  
 “ runt.” Now the different expositions thus conſidered, comprize the ſeveral parts of the “ Neceſſary  
 “ Erudition,” published in that year.

If theſe productions be minutely examined, not only the ideas, but ſometimes the very language, of the Lutherans will appear to have been cloſely copied in both, upon the ſubject at leaſt before me. The reader may find the Articles in Burnet’s Hiſt. Reform. vol. i. Addenda, p. 305 ; ſome account of “ The Neceſſary Erudition” in the ſame work, vol. i. p. 286. and of “ The Inſtitution” in Collier’s Eccleſ. Hiſt. vol. ii. p. 139.

I have fixed the date of the “ Neceſſary Erudition” in 1543, as Collier has correctly done, and not three years before, according to Burnet. The latter obſerves, “ It was finiſhed and ſet forth in this year,  
 “ (viz. 1540.) with a preface written by thoſe of the  
 “ Clergy, who had been employed in it (a preface  
 “ however, which never exiſted except in his own ima-  
 “ gination.) To this the King *added* another preface  
 “ ſome years after.” Vol. i. p. 293. But this is not all. To corroborate his ſtatement, Burnet miſquotes an Act of Parliament, which paſſed in the year when the work actually appeared, but before it was completed for publication. In this ſtatute, (he remarks)  
 all

all the Books of the Old and New Testament of Tindal's translation are forbidden to be kept or used in the King's dominions, "with all other books *contrary to the doctrine set forth in the year 1540.*" And again, "Every person might read and teach in their houses *the book set out in the year 1540.*" vol. i. p. 322. Now the words of the Act are these: in the first instance, "contrary to that doctrine, which, *since the year of our Lord 1540, is, or any time hereafter during the King's Majesty's life, &c. . . . shall be set forth by his Highness;*" and in the second instance, (not *the book set out in the year 1540, but*) "*all such doctrine, as, since the said year of our Lord 1540, is or shall be set forth by the King's Majesty, &c.*" expressions certainly conveying a meaning very different from that of Burnet. The truth was, that the commissioners appointed to draw up the work in question (as mentioned in the subsequent note) did certainly meet in 1540; but that the work itself was not published until after the prorogation of the Parliament, on the 12th of May. During the last week in April we find it in the hands of the Convocation; and on the following 29th of May it was printed.

I have been the more particular on this occasion in pointing out the inaccuracies of Burnet, because he seems in general to have been too implicitly trusted, misleading perhaps subsequent writers by his loose style, and looser statements, more than any other historian.

Page 14, note (6).

In the year 1540, a motion was made by Cromwell, in the upper House, for the appointment of a committee "of Bishops and Divines, to draw up an exposition of those things, that were necessary for the institution of a Christian man." Burnet, vol. i. p. 274, and Journal of the House of Lords, in which

Cromwell's Speech is given. The committee was accordingly appointed, and drew up, not the work entitled, "The Institution of a Christian Man," which had been published three years before, but that which was termed, "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man." Cromwell's motion for the appointment of the committee was made April 13, 1540; upon the 13th of June following, he was arrested and sent to the Tower, and upon the 28th of July beheaded. Seven days before his execution, a bill passed both Houses of Parliament, which empowered this committee, or any other which the King might appoint, "to declare *the principal Articles of the Christian belief*, with the ceremonies, and way of God's "service to be observed." It appears by Fox's Martyrology, vol. ii. p. 1693. ed. 1610, that at this precise period these Commissioners attempted to establish such Doctrines, as might tend to the revival of Popish error and superstition; that even Bishop Heath and Bishop Skip (who were in the commission, and friendly to the Protestant cause) earnestly entreated Cranmer not to oppose the design, for fear of incurring the King's displeasure; but that he resisted their entreaties, disdainingly, as Fox terms it, to deal colourably on the occasion, notwithstanding the dread of Henry's anger, and the alarming effects of it visible in the sudden fall and expected fate of Cromwell; "and that in the "end, by discharging his conscience, and declaring "the truth unto the King, God so wrought with the "King, that his Highness joined with him against the "rest, so that, the book of Articles passing on his "side, he won the goal from them all, contrary to all "their expectations, when many wagers would have "been laid in London, that he should have been laid "up with Cromwell, at that time in the Tower for  
" his



“his stiff standing to his tackle. After that day,” adds the historian, “there could neither Counsellor, Bishop, or Papist, win him out of the King’s favour.” The Articles in question, or what are given as such, may be seen in Strype’s Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. i. Appendix, p. 306. They were probably intended, as the same writer observes, (vol. i. p. 356.) to contain “the public judgment and professed doctrine of the Church of England,” as they constantly commence with the phrases, “Docemus, credimus.” From them, parts of our 25th, 26th, and 34th Articles were borrowed. In our 25th Art. (as worded in 1552.) the Sacraments are thus defined; “Sacramenta a Christo instituta non tantum sunt notæ professionis Christianorum, sed certa quædam potius testimonia, et efficacia signa gratiæ atque bonæ in nos voluntatis Dei, per quæ invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat” This was manifestly taken from the production of the year 1540, above alluded to. “Docemus,” it is there said, “quod Sacramenta, quæ per verbum Dei instituta sunt, non tantum sunt notæ professionis inter Christianos, sed magis certa quædam testimonia et efficacia signa gratiæ, et bonæ voluntatis Dei erga nos, per quæ Deus invisibiliter operatur in nobis, et suam gratiam in nos invisibiliter diffundit, siquidem ea rite susceperimus. Quodque per ea excitatur et confirmatur fides in his, qui eis utuntur.” Strype’s Eccles. Mem. vol. i. Appendix, p. 306. But even this passage is derived from the following in the Augsbourg Confession; “De Sacramentorum usu docent, quod Sacramenta instituta sunt, non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa, et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos.” Art. 13. Augst. Confess.

## 26th Article of our Church.

“ Quamvis in Ecclesia visibili bonis mali sint semper  
 “ admixti, atque interdum ministerio verbi et Sacra-  
 “ mentorum administrationi præsent, tamen non suo,  
 “ sed Christi nomine agant, ejusque mandato et au-  
 “ thoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum  
 “ in verbo Dei audiendo, tum in Sacramentis percipi-  
 “ endis, neque per illorum malitiam effectus instituto-  
 “ rum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minui-  
 “ tur, quoad eos, qui fide et rite sibi oblata percipiunt,  
 “ quæ propter institutionem Christi, et promissionem  
 “ efficacia sunt, licet per malos administrentur.”

## Articles of 1540.

“ Et quamvis in Ecclesia secundum posteriorem ac-  
 “ ceptionem mali sunt bonis admixti, atque etiam mi-  
 “ nisteriis verbi et Sacramentorum nonnunquam præ-  
 “ sent, tamen, cum ministrent non suo, sed Christi no-  
 “ mine mandato et authoritatē, licet eorum ministerio  
 “ uti, tam in verbo audiendo quam recipiendis Sacra-  
 “ mentis, juxta illud, *Qui vos audit, me audit.* Nec  
 “ per eorum malitiam imminuitur effectus, aut gratia  
 “ donorum Christi rite accipientibus. Sunt enim effi-  
 “ cacia propter promissionem et ordinationem Christi,  
 “ etiam si per malos exhibeantur.”

## Augsbourgh Confession.

“ Cum in hac vita multi hypocritæ et mali admixti  
 “ sint, licet uti Sacramentis, quæ per malos admini-  
 “ strantur, juxta vocem Christi, Matt. xxiii. 2. *Sedent*  
 “ *Scribæ et Pharisei in cathedra Moysi, &c.* Et Sacra-  
 “ menta et verbum propter ordinationem et mandatum  
 “ Christi sunt efficacia, etiam si per malos exhibeantur.”  
 Art. 8.

## 34th Article of our Church.

“ Traditiones atque ceremonias easdem non omni-  
 “ no necesse est esse ubique, aut prorsus consimiles.  
 “ Nam

“ Nam et variæ semper fuerunt, et mutari possunt pro  
 “ regionum, temporum, et morum diversitate, modo  
 “ nihil contra verbum Dei instituat.”

Articles of 1540.

“ Traditiones vero et ritus atque ceremonias, quæ  
 “ vel ad decorem, vel ordinem, vel disciplinam Ec-  
 “ clesiæ ab hominibus sunt institutæ, non omnino ne-  
 “ cessæ est, ut eadem sint ubique aut prorsus similes.  
 “ Hæ enim et variæ fuere, et variari possunt pro re-  
 “ gionum atque morum diversitate ac commodo, sic  
 “ tamen, ut sint consentientes verbo Dei.”

Augsburgh Confession.

“ Nec necesse est ubique similes esse traditiones hu-  
 “ manas, seu ritus, aut ceremonias ab hominibus insti-  
 “ tutas.” Art. 7.

In contemplating the doctrinal Reformation of Henry's reign, we should not perhaps attribute so much importance to the counsels of Cromwell, as we usually do; for, by a diligent perusal of these Articles, we perceive how ably Cranmer could contend without him. Nor ought we to regard it as detached from that which followed; because we see that the same person was principally concerned in both, and in the latter instance not forgetful of what he had effected in the former.

*Page 15, note (7).*

The origin of our Common Prayer is by no means dubious. An abridgement of the Service of the Romish Church, with such alterations and amendments, as were judged requisite to purify it from error and superstition, became the Liturgy of the Lutherans. Our own was modelled in the same way, being little more than a compilation of the ancient forms, selected with prudence, corrected with judgment, and arranged with

simplicity. In most parts of it our Reformers kept in view a work of a similar description, then recently drawn up by Melancthon and Bucer, for the use of the Archbishopric of Cologne. This I shall have occasion to notice hereafter.

Calvin, on the other hand, (who equally approved of public forms, and never, like his followers in after-times, dreamed of praying by the Spirit,) chose rather to become an author than compiler, preferring the task of composing a new Liturgy, to that of reforming an old one. A performance of this kind he originally prepared in French, and seems to have first used, when he taught at Strasbourg. This he afterwards translated into Latin, with emendations, and published at Geneva, as the form of that Church, in the year 1545. See his *Opuscula*, p. 39. Another translation of the same work was printed at London, in 1551, by Valerandus Pollanus, his successor at Strasbourg, then a refugee in England. Now it is certain, that our own Liturgy, as it first appeared in 1548, bore not the most distant resemblance to this novel production. In 1552 however, when the same was revised and republished, the introductory Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution, then added at the beginning of our Daily Prayer, were in some degree taken from it, yet not from Calvin's own translation, but from that of Pollanus, which was printed in England at the very period when the Book of Common Prayer was under revision. This is evident from the circumstance, that the translation of Pollanus alone contains an *Absolution*, Calvin's not having the slightest trace of one. If it be conjectured, that our Reformers took the hint alluded to from the former translation, because they were ignorant of the latter, it shews how little the  
pro-

production of Calvin was at that time known; if because they preferred the former, it shews how little it was regarded.

After all, the idea only of such forms, or at most an occasional allusion or two, seems to have been borrowed. In proof of which I shall subjoin the Latin of Pollanus. “Die Dominico mane, hora octava, cum  
“jam adest populus, Pastore accedente, Choraules incipit clara voce, Leve le Cueur, ac populus accinit  
“cum modestia et gravitate summa, ut ne quid voluptati aurium, sed ferviant omnia reverentiæ Dei et  
“ædificationi tam canentium quam audientium, si qui  
“fortasse adsint non canentes. Cum absolverint primam tabulam” (viz. Decalogi), “tum Pastor, mensæ  
“astans, versus ad populum sic incipit;

‘Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini, qui fecit  
‘cælum et terram. Amen.’

“Deinde clara et distincta voce populum admonet  
“de confessione peccatorum, hisque verbis præit;

‘Fratres, cogitet unusquisque se coram Deo sisti, ut  
‘peccata et delicta sua omnia simplici animo confiteatur, et agnoscat, atque apud vosmetipsos me præcuntem sequimini his verbis;’

#### Confessio Peccatorum.

‘Domine Deus, Pater æternæ et omnipotens, agnoscimus et fatemur ingenuè apud sanctissimam majestatem tuam, peccatores esse nos miseros, adeoque a  
‘prima origine, qua concepti et nati sumus, tam ad  
‘omne malum esse pronos, quam ab omni bono alienos; quo vitio tuas leges sanctissimas assidue transgredimur, eoque nobis exitium justissimo tuo judicio  
‘conquirimus. Attamen Domine Deus, poenitet sic  
‘offendisse bonitatem tuam, proindeque nos et facta  
‘nostra omnia nimium scelerata damnamus, orantes,  
‘ut tu pro tua clementia huic nostræ calamitati succurras.

‘ curras. Miserere igitur nostri omnium, O Deus et  
 ‘ Pater clementissime ac misericors, per nomen Filii tui  
 ‘ Jesu Christi, Domini nostri, te obtestamur; ac deletis  
 ‘ vitiis, ablutisque sordibus cunctis, largire atque ad-  
 ‘ auge indies Spiritus tui Sancti vim et dona in nobis,  
 ‘ quo vere et serio nostram miseriam intelligentes, nos-  
 ‘ tramque injustitiam agnoscentes, veram pœnitentiam  
 ‘ agamus; qua mortui peccato deinceps abundemus  
 ‘ fructibus justitiæ ac innocentiae, quibus tibi placeamus  
 ‘ per Jesum Christum Filium tuum, unicum Redemp-  
 ‘ torem ac Mediatorem nostrum. Amen.’

#### Absolutio.

“ Hic Pastor ex Scriptura sacra sententiam aliquam  
 “ remissionis peccatorum populo recitat, in nomine Pa-  
 “ tris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.”

Another circumstance likewise strongly corroborates  
 the observation which has been made. In the amended  
 Liturgy of Edward VI. besides the additions men-  
 tioned, the Ten Commandments, with the Responses  
 subjoined to them at the beginning of our Commu-  
 nion, were first introduced. That the propriety of  
 such an introduction was suggested by the work of  
 Pollanus, appears almost certain from the circumstance  
 of the Decalogue being there ordered to be read at  
 the beginning of the Sunday Service, with the fol-  
 lowing Prayer after it; “ Domine Deus, Pater miseri-  
 “ cors, qui hoc Decalogo per servum tuum Moysen nos  
 “ legis tuæ justitiam docuisti, *dignare cordibus nostris*  
 “ *eam ita tuo Spiritu inscribere, ut &c.*” words almost  
 precisely corresponding with our concluding response,  
 “ Write all these thy laws in our hearts, we beseech  
 “ thee.” That it could not be suggested by Calvin’s  
 publication, is beyond conjecture, because neither the  
 reading of the Decalogue, nor the subsequent Prayer,  
 is there to be found. A short account of the Stras-  
 bourg

bourg Liturgy, in many respects different from that of Geneva, may be seen in Strype's *Eccles. Mem.* vol. i. p. 243.

*Page 15, note (8).*

See note 4.

*Page 16, note (9).*

The Catechism alluded to Cranmer first published in the year 1547. In his answer to Gardiner it is thus noticed ;

“Winchester.

“Justus Jonas hath translated a Catechism out of  
“Dutch into Latin, taught in the city of Noremberg  
“in Germany, where Osiander is chief Preacher. . . .  
“which Catechism was translated into English, in  
“this author's name, about two years past.” Answer  
to Gardiner, p. 14.

“Canterbury.

“And as for the Catechism of Germany, by me  
“translated into English. . . .” Ibid. p. 199.

To the niece of Osiander, it should be observed, Cranmer was married. Justus Jonas was the friend and fellow-labourer of Luther and Melancthon, whose son resided long at Lambeth, and seems to have been the principal medium of correspondence between the Archbishop and the Lutherans. In the College library of C. C. C. Oxford, there is a copy of Luther's works, the two first volumes of which appear to have belonged to the Primate. In the title-page of both is written “Thomas Cantuarien.” apparently in his own hand-writing, and at the bottom, the following inscription, probably in that of Jonas ; “Reverendissimo  
“in Christo patri, ac Domino Domino Thomæ Cran-  
“mero Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, fideli primati An-  
“gliæ, domino suo clementissimo exhibuit Justus Jo-  
“nas Junior, 1548.” Indeed, as Strype observes, to  
Germany

Germany "he had a particular kindness . . . . he had  
 " many exhibitioners there; and held at least a month-  
 " ly correspondence to and from learned Germans." Memorials of Cranmer, p. 287. That the doctrine upon the Eucharist contained in this Catechism is completely Lutheran, has never been denied. "This," said Cranmer, "I confess of myself, that not long before I wrote the said Catechism, I was in that error of the real presence, as I was in many years past in divers other errors, as of transubstantiation, &c." Answer to Gardiner, p. 402.

*Page 17, note (10).*

"But as for any untrue report made by me herein, willingly against my conscience, (as you untruly report of me), by that time I have joined with you throughout your book, you shall right well perceive, I trust, that I have said nothing wittingly, but what my conscience shall be able to defend at the great day, in the sight of the everliving God." Answer to Gardiner, p. 50.

In the year 1550, he published his principal work, entitled, "A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament, &c." This was almost immediately attacked by the Bishop of Winchester; and supported in an able refutation of his opponent's arguments by Cranmer. Gardiner (as might have been expected) failed not to point out the inconsistency between the Catechism and the new production, which evidently militated against Consubstantiation, as well as Transubstantiation, accusing its author of having been first a Papist upon this point, afterwards a Lutheran, and at last a Zuinglian. The same accusation was likewise brought against him by another adversary, of the name of Smith. To this charge the Archbishop pleaded guilty, feeling no disgrace in a change



change of opinion for the better, and explaining the progress of improvement in his mind with no less simplicity than sincerity. "After," he observed, "it had pleased God to shew unto me by his word a more perfect knowledge of his Son Jesus Christ, from time to time, as I grew in knowledge of him, by little and little I put away my former ignorance. And as God of his mercy gave me light, so through his grace I opened my eyes to receive it, and did not wilfully repugn unto God, and remain in darkness. And I trust in God's mercy and pardon for my former errors, because I erred but of frailness and ignorance." Answer to Gardiner, p. 402. And again, "It is lawful and commendable for a man to learn from time to time, and to go from his ignorance, that he may receive and embrace the truth. As for me, I am not, I grant, of that nature, that the Papists for most part be, who study to devise all shameful shifts, rather than they will forsake any error, wherewith they were infected in youth." Ibid. p. 62. Those who have accurately investigated his character, and duly appreciate its value, must read with pleasure the following awful appeal to heaven, against the false imputation of a time-serving flexibility in his religious sentiments. "I will not here answer for myself, but leave the judgment to God, who seeth the bottom of all men's hearts, and at whose only judgment I shall stand or fall, saving, that this I will say before him, (who is every where present, and knoweth all things that be done,) that as for seeking to please men in this matter, I think my conscience clear, that I never sought herein, but only the pleasure and glory of God." Ibid. p. 403.

It may not perhaps be altogether irrelevant to the subject of this note, as bespeaking his confidence in the

the goodness of his cause, if I add here the admirable strictures which he passes upon the argument of his opponents. "Wherefore," he remarks, "inasmuch as I purpose, God willing, in this defence of my former book, not only to answer you, but by the way also to touch D. Smith; two things I would wish in you both. The one is, truth with simplicity; the other is, that either of you both had so much learning as you think you have, or else, that you thought of yourselves no more than you have indeed. But to answer both your books in few words. The one sheweth nothing else, but what railing, without reason or learning, the other what forwardness armed with wit and eloquence, be able to do against the truth." Ibid. p. 39. "Thus have I answered to all that you have brought against my fourth book, not obscurely, (as you like a cuttel have done, hiding yourself in your dark colours,) but plainly, to the capacity of all men, as much as I can. And this have I done with some pain of writing, but little or no study of the matter; it being a very easy thing, for defence of the truth, to answer by God's word and ancient authors to an ignorant lawyer, well exercised in neither, but making such divinity as he can dream in his sleep, or devise of his own brain, or hath sucked out of Papistical laws and decrees; and for lack of argument furnishing up his book with pretty toys, with glorious boasting, and scornful tauntings." p. 249. "..... But to avoid and dally away these words, that be so clear and plain, there must need be laid on load of words, the wit must be stretched out to the utmost, all fetches must be brought in that can be devised, all colours of rhetoric must be sought out, all the air must be cast over with clouds, all the

"water

“ water darkened with the cuttel’s ink, and, if it could  
 “ be, (at the least as much as may be,) all men’s eyes  
 “ also must be put out, that they should not see. But I  
 “ could wish, that you stood not so much in your own  
 “ conceit, trusted not so much in your inventions and  
 “ devices of wit, in eloquence, and craftiness of speech,  
 “ and multitude of words, looking that no man should  
 “ dare encounter you, but that all men should think  
 “ you speak well, because you speak much, and that  
 “ you should be had in great reputation among the  
 “ multitude of them that be ignorant, and cannot dis-  
 “ cern perfectly those, that follow the right way of  
 “ truth, from others, that would lead them into error  
 “ and blindness.” p. 312.

*Page 18, note (11).*

“ He had a good judgment, but no great quickness  
 “ of apprehension, nor closeness of style, which was  
 “ diffused and unconnected; therefore when any thing  
 “ was to be penned that required more nerves, he  
 “ made use of Ridley.” Burnet’s History of the Re-  
 formation, vol. ii. p. 336. The same censure is co-  
 pied into the Biographica Britannica, and retained  
 in the last edition.

The above insinuation of Burnet respecting the inca-  
 pacity of Cranmer, although in fact nothing more than  
 broad assertion, unsupported by the adduction of the  
 slightest proof, seems to have given rise to an idea,  
 that he only was the nominal, and Ridley the real, au-  
 thor of those compositions, to which his name was af-  
 fixed. This however was placed before none, except  
 the Catechism above alluded to, and his treatise  
 upon the Sacrament. Of the Catechism the Archbi-  
 shop expressly declares himself to have been the trans-  
 lator. Besides, it does not appear, that upon the  
 point of the real presence, his supposed assistant was  
 ever

ever a Lutheran. That Ridley was not the author of the latter and more important work, his own testimony remains on record; "Now, quoth he then; "and how can ye make but a figure or a sign of the "Sacrament, as that book doth, which is set forth in "my Lord of Canterbury's name? I wifs, ye can tell "who made it. Did not ye make it? And here was "much murmuring of the rest, as if they would have "given me the glory of the writing of that book, which "yet was said of some of them to contain the most heinous heresy that ever was." He then, without hesitation, answered, "That book was made by a great "and learned man, and one that was able to do the "like again. And that as for himself, he assured "them, and bad them not to be deceived in him, that "he was never able to do or write any such thing; "and that the writer passed him no less than the "learned master, his young scholar." Ridley's Conference in the Tower, written by himself, and published in Fox's Martyrology, p. 1298. That this book must have been Cranmer's treatise on the Sacrament, cannot be doubted, when it is recollected, that no other was set forth in the Archbishop's name, (the defence of it against Gardiner I consider as a part of the same work,) except the Lutheran Catechism of 1547, which, from its sentiments upon the subject of the Lord's Supper, could not have been the production alluded to. The marginal conjecture, therefore, of Fox, that it was the Catechism, is evidently erroneous.

Nor ought we on this occasion to suspect any inaccuracy in the detail of Ridley's conference, because it was written by himself. When Fox reports, through the medium of his adversaries, he wishes not always (p. 1702.) too implicitly to be trusted.

But in truth no stronger evidence upon this point seems

seems requisite, than what the remains of Ridley, preserved by the Martyrologist, themselves afford; the style of which is manifestly different from that exhibited in the writings ascribed to Cranmer. In my own idea, much inferior to it.

It is singular however, that while the Papists affected to believe, that Ridley was the author of the Archbishop's work upon the Sacrament, they accused the Archbishop of having written P. Martyr's treatise upon the same subject. "Item, that the said Thomas Cranmer . . . . . did compile, and cause to be set abroad, divers books. Whereunto, when the names of the books were recited unto him, he denyed not such books, which he was the true author of. As touching the treatise of P. Martyr upon the Sacrament, he denyed that he ever saw it, before it was abroad, yet did approve and well like it." Fox, p. 1704.

Perhaps their object was similar in both instances; they might have hoped in the first, to obtain more positive and allegeable proof, than they seemed at the time to possess, against Ridley, whose love of truth would have induced him, if at all concerned in it, not to disavow it; and in the second, to procure an additional charge against Cranmer.

*Page 19, note (12).*

"Itaque fuit crematus Angliæ primas, maximæ vir eruditionis et authoritatis." Sleidani Commentarii, anno 1556.—"Quibus perceptis, antiquissimos tam Græcos quam Latinos patres evoluit: concilia omnia, et antiquitatem, ad ipsa Apostolorum tempora, investigavit. Theologiam totam, detracta illa, quam Sophistæ obduxerunt, vitiata cute, ad vivum refecavit; quam tamen non doctrina magis quam moribus atque vita expressit." Archbishop Parker's *Antiquit. Britannicæ*, p. 331.—"Quæque vir humanissimus a  
*"Gratiis*

"*Gratiis et Musis factus* promisit, ea omnia cumula-  
 "tissime præstitit." Melchior. Adam. *Vitæ Theologo-*  
*rum Exterorum*, p. 18. Other testimonies might be  
 adduced from P. Martyr's preface to his tract on the  
 Sacrament, and Osiander, &c. Tremellius, as Gilpin  
 remarks, terms him, "ὁμοῦ φιλόξενος, nec minus φι-  
 "λόλογος." *Life of Cranmer*, p. 231.

*Page 20, note (13).*

Probably one short specimen of the manner, in  
 which, when he pleased, he was capable of expressing  
 himself, may be sufficient to disprove the censure of  
 Burnet. After noticing with some severity that the  
 Romish Antichrist and his Ministers, in their doctrine  
 of deliverance from Purgatory, "take upon them to  
 "do for us, that thing which Christ either would  
 "not, or could not do," he thus exclaims; "O hay-  
 "nous blasphemy, and most detestable injury against  
 "Christ! O wicked abomination in the temple of God!  
 "O pride intolerable of Antichrist, and most manifest  
 "token of the Son of Perdition, extolling himself  
 "above God, and with Lucifer exalting his seat and  
 "power above the throne of God!" Preface to his  
*Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sa-*  
*crament*. Ought he, who was master of language  
 like this, to be slighted as incoherent, spiritless, and  
 inelegant? But to form a thorough conception of his  
 style, it is necessary to consult his writings themselves,  
 in which, to use his own expressions, he flattered him-  
 self, that he had made "more clearly appear the  
 "light from the darkness, the truth from false sophist-  
 "ical subtleties, and the certain word of God from  
 "men's dreams and phantastical inventions." *Ibid.*  
 p. 14. He is not indeed always nervous, but he is  
 always clear and flowing, eloquent and impressive.

*Page*

Page 21, note (<sup>14</sup>).

To give an adequate idea of his diction seems difficult. It has a certain unobtrusive elegance about it, which mocks description ;

*Illam*—

*Componit furtim, subsequiturque decor.*

Tibullus Eleg. iv. 2. 8.

Page 21, note (<sup>15</sup>).

The difference of style in Henry's and Edward's time, from that which began to prevail in Elizabeth's, appears striking, when we compare the works of the same person at the different æras. In the reign of Henry, an author of the name of Taverner, who was "Clerk of the Signets" to that Monarch, wrote a paraphrase upon the Epistles and Gospels of the year, which was very gravely and decently composed. The same person is said by Antony Wood to have delivered a singular Sermon (being a licensed preacher, although a layman) at St. Mary's, Oxford, in the reign of Elizabeth, which thus commenced ; "Arriving at  
"the mount of St. Mary's, in the stony stage where  
"now I stand, I have brought some biscuits, baked in  
"the oven of charity, carefully conserved for the  
"chickens of the Church, the sparrows of the Spirit,  
"and the sweet swallows of salvation." History and Antiq. of the Univ. of Oxford, vol. ii. p. 152. Indeed, at an intervening period, we perceive some occasional traces of so perverted a taste in the letters of those, who were imprisoned by Mary for their attachment to the Reformation ; but these principally occur in the compositions of illiterate men. Careless, a Coventry weaver, thus expresses himself in a letter to a fellow-prisoner, whose name was Green. "Oh blessed Green ! Thou meek and loving lamb of the  
"Lord ! How happy art thou to be appointed to die

“ for his sake ! A full dainty dish art thou for the  
 “ Lord’s own tooth. Fresh and green shalt thou be in  
 “ the house of the Lord, and thy fruits shall never  
 “ wither nor decay.” Fox’s Martyrol. p. 1746. And  
 again, in a letter to Philpot ; “ Oh my good master  
 “ Philpot, which art a principal pot indeed, filled with  
 “ most precious liquor, as it appeareth by the plen-  
 “ teous pouring forth of the same ! Oh pot most hap-  
 “ py, of the high Potter ordained to honour, which  
 “ doest contain such heavenly treasures in the earthen  
 “ vessel ! Oh pot thrice happy !” Id. 1745.

What a complete contrast does the language of this unlettered man form with the following extract from an epistle of Lady Jane Gray to her sister, at the same period ; “ Be penitent for your sins, and yet despair  
 “ not : be strong in faith, and yet presume not.” Ibid. p. 1292.

*Page 21, note (16).*

How highly the composition of our Liturgy ranked in the estimation of so good a judge as Swift, appears from the following passage in his letter to the Lord Treasurer, containing a proposal for correcting, improving, and ascertaining the English tongue. “ Then,” he remarks, “ as to the greatest part of our Liturgy,  
 “ compiled long before the translation of the Bible  
 “ now in use, and little altered since, there seem to be  
 “ in it as great strains of true sublime eloquence, as  
 “ are any where to be found in our language ; which  
 “ every man of good taste will observe in the Com-  
 “ munion Service, that of Burial, and other parts.”

Indeed so admirable was the style of those who composed it, that even in the parts which are direct translations from the ancient Latin forms, they preserved all the grace and spirit of original composition. In proof of this assertion may be alleged the following  
 passage



passage in our Communion Service, which is almost literally taken from the Preface to the Canon of the Mass; "It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should, at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God! Therefore, with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name, evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Glory be to thee, O Lord most high."

Compared with this, in how disadvantageous a point of view, how flat and heavy, appears the subsequent translation of the same preface, by a Roman Catholic Bishop of the present day. "It is truly meet and just, right and wholesome, that we always, and in all places, should give thanks to thee, O holy Lord, Almighty Father, Everlasting God, through Christ our Lord. Through whom the angels give praise to thee, the dominations adore, the powers tremble, the heavens, and the virtues of the heavens, and the blessed seraphims, with common jubilee join in glorifying thy Majesty. With whom we beseech thee, that thou wouldst order our voices also to be admitted, saying with a most humble confession, Holy, holy, holy Lord God of Sabaoth. The heavens and the earth are full of thy glory; hosanna in the highest; blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." See p. 89 of a small tract, entitled, "The Garden of the Soul; or a Manual of Spiritual Exercises, &c." by the Ven. and R. R. Dr. Richard Challoner, Bishop of Debra, and Vicar Apostolic. Lond. 1799.

The collect for the 7th Sunday after Trinity commences in these words; "Deus virtutum, cujus est

“totum, quod est optimum, inferre pectoribus nostris  
 “amorem tui nominis, &c.” With what spirit is it  
 thus rendered; “Lord of all power and might, who  
 “art the author and giver of all good things, graft in  
 “our hearts the love of thy name, &c.”

But the superiority in the language of our Liturgy  
 will appear perhaps more striking, if we contrast a  
 short prayer in it, first translated from the Latin Bre-  
 viary for the Primer of Henry VIII. (in which, indeed,  
 the whole of our present Litany is to be found) with  
 another, derived from the same source, and published  
 at the same period. “Deus, cui proprium est misereri  
 “semper et parcere, suscipe deprecationes nostras, ut,  
 “quos delictorum catena constringit, miseratio tuæ  
 “pietatis absolvat per Christum Dominum nostrum.”

“O God, whose nature and property is ever to have  
 “mercy and to forgive, receive our humble petitions;  
 “and, though we be tied and bound with the chain  
 “of our sins, yet let the pitifulness of thy great  
 “mercy loose us, for the honour of Jesus Christ, our  
 “Mediator and Advocate.”

“God, to whom it is appropriated to be merciful  
 “ever and to spare, take our prayer, and let thy mer-  
 “ciful pity assuage them, that be bound with the chain  
 “of sins, by Christ our Lord. So be it.” The Pri-  
 mer in English and Latin, after the use of Sarum, &c.  
 anno 1543, published by F. Petit.

*Page 23, note (17).*

Answer to Gardiner, p. 402.

*Page 24, note (18).*

Id. p. 59.

*Page 24, note (19).*

That our own Liturgy was by no means formed  
 upon the model of Calvin's, I have already pointed  
 out in note 7. It will be shewn in the subsequent  
 Sermon,

**Sermon**, (see pages 45, 46, 47, and notes 17, 18.) that, when our Church was founded, neither his name nor doctrines had acquired that importance in the Protestant world, which both afterwards attained.



---

# NOTES

## ON SERMON II.

*Page 28, note (1).*

ONE of Luther's early publications was entitled, "De Captivitate Babylonica."

*Page 29, note (2).*

According to Strype, Cranmer received an order to prepare a book of Articles in the year 1551, which, when compiled, was communicated to the Bishops in the same year. In May 1552, the Articles thus drawn up were laid before the Privy Council. In the following September they were revised, arranged in a different order, received titles which had not been before affixed to them, and considerably augmented. Thus improved, they were finally returned to the Privy Council in November; and in the early part of the year 1553, were ratified and published. Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, p. 272.

*Page 29, note (3).*

"As for the Catechism, the book of Articles, with the other book against Winchester, &c. he granted the same to be his doing." Fox's Martyrology, p. 1704.

*Page 30, note (4).*

"Ridley. I put forth no Catechism.

"Cole. Did you never consent to the setting out of those things, which you allowed?

“*Ridley*. I grant that I saw the book, but I deny  
 “that I wrote it. I perused it after it was made, and  
 “*I noted many things for it*. So I consented to the  
 “book. *I was not the author of it*. These Articles  
 “were set out, I both willing, and consenting to  
 “them.” Ridley’s Examination in Fox’s Martyr. p.  
 1317. In this and in other passages of Fox, where  
 the Catechism and the Articles are mentioned, the  
 latter are evidently comprehended under the appella-  
 tion of the former. The fact is, that a Catechism  
 drawn up at this period, “a pio quodam et erudito  
 “viro,” (as it is expressed in the preface,) was pub-  
 lished, and commended by royal authority to the use  
 of schools, having the Articles usually subjoined to it.  
 The title-page was, “Catechismus brevis, Christianæ  
 “disciplinæ summam continens, omnibus ludimagi-  
 “stris autoritate regia commendatus. Huic Cate-  
 “chismo adjuncti sunt Articuli, de quibus in ultima  
 “Synodo Londinensi, anno Dom. 1552, ad tollendam  
 “opinionum dissensionem, &c. inter episcopos et alios  
 “eruditos viros convenerat, regia similiter autoritate  
 “promulgati.” The title therefore of the Catechism  
 never imported, that it was set forth by Convocation,  
 which that of the Articles seemed to do. We cannot  
 be at a loss to fix a proper meaning upon the expres-  
 sion, “the Catechism,” in the following quotation,  
 and from thence may estimate the sense in which it is  
 used by Fox on other occasions. “And for that, said  
 “he,” (viz. Weston the Prolocutor) “there is a book  
 “late set forth, called *the Catechism*, which he shewed  
 “forth, bearing the name of this honourable Synod,  
 “and yet put forth without your consents, as I have  
 “learned, being a book very pestiferous and full of  
 “heresies; and likewise a book of Common Prayer,  
 “very abominable, as it pleased him to term it; I  
 “thought

“thought therefore best first to begin with *the Articles of the Catechism*, concerning the Sacrament of the “Altar, &c.” Account of the Disputation in the Convocation, p. 1282.

I have already remarked, that the Articles were generally, although not always, annexed to the Catechism, whence probably arose the confusion in the phraseology of the Martyrologist. It is singular however, that, while both were frequently printed together, and both sanctioned by royal authority, one, in a single point at least, should directly contradict the other. In the Catechism a millenium is thus plainly asserted; “*Adhuc non est occisus Antichristus, quo fit ut nos desideremus et precemur, ut id tandem aliquando contingat et impleatur, utque solus Christus regnet cum suis sanctis, secundum divinas promissiones, utque vivat et dominetur in mundo.*” In *petit. Domin. Orat.* “*Adveniat regnum tuum.*” In the Articles it is as plainly rejected; “*Qui millenariorum fabulam revocare conantur, sacris literis adversantur.*” Art. 41.

But leaving those who are disposed to explain our Articles by this Catechism, (which, by the way, seems to have been composed after them, and, when once thrown aside, was never again brought forward,) to reconcile this difference, I must add, that the dubious expression of Fox alluded to, has led an author of respectability into an error so gross, as to carry with it its own refutation. Strype, in his *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, (vol. ii. p. 32.) absurdly supposes, that Cranmer’s Lutheran Catechism, published in 1547, (not distinguishing between the two Catechisms,) was again printed towards the end of Edward’s reign, and was approved of by a Convocation!

On this occasion, to shew what little dependence is  
to

to be placed upon the authority of the most artless historian of the period under our consideration, without constant reference to original documents, I shall subjoin another mistake of the same writer, still more strange, who appears never to err with design, and who certainly is never seduced from the plain path of simple narrative, by the temptation of a well turned period. Speaking of Alexander Alefs, he observes, "And as Melancthon made use of him in composing his thoughts into a handsome style," (of which however no proof is adduced,) "so did another great light of the same nation; I mean Bucer. In King Edward's days he had wrote a book in the German, that is, in his own country language, about Ordination to the Ministry in this kingdom of England, intituled, 'Ordinatio Ecclesiæ, seu Ministerii Ecclesiastici, in florentissimo Angliæ regno;' this our Alefs turned into Latin, and published for the consolation of the Churches every where in these sad times, as it ran in the title." Memorials of Cranmer, p. 403. Now it is certain, that Bucer never wrote any work in German, nor Alefs in Latin, upon such a subject. Had Strype looked beyond the title of the treatise he referred to, and even that he palpably misconceived, he could not have fallen into so unaccountable an error. Among the Scripta Anglicana of Bucer, occurs the following; "Ordinatio Ecclesiæ, seu Ministerii Ecclesiastici, in florentissimo regno Angliæ, conscripta sermone patrio, et in Latinam linguam bona fide conversa, et ad consolationem Ecclesiarum Christi ubicunque locorum ac gentium, his tristissimis temporibus, edita ab Alex. Aleffio." p. 370. This is no other than a translation of our own Common Prayer Book, as originally compiled, into Latin; a translation which Bucer, who was unacquainted with English,  
used



used in the observations, which he made upon it, previously to its revision by a Committee of Bishops and Divines in the latter part of Edward's reign.

Upon the general question of Ridley's aid in the composition of our Articles, it is curious to mark the progress of conjectural assertion. Strype conceives "that the Archbishop was the penner, or at least the great director, of them, *with the assistance, as is very probable, of Bishop Ridley.*" Memor. of Cranmer, p. 272. Burnet makes a similar remark. When this gets into the hands of Neal, we find "that it was resolved in Council to reform the Doctrine of the Church, and that Archbishop Cranmer and *Bishop Ridley* were appointed to this work." History of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 49.

Page 30, Note (5).

Hugoni Latimero . . . . . quem passim vocabant *Apostolum Anglorum*. Saunders de Schismate Anglicano, p. 116.

Page 34, Note (6).

Before I quote the Epistles of Melancthon, upon the subject more immediately referred to, it may be necessary previously to state, that his correspondence with Cranmer had been of long standing. So early as in the year 1535, it appears, that he submitted to the judgment of the Archbishop a work, which he was then about to publish, with a dedication to Henry. His letter on this occasion was thus expressed: "Cum autem non dubitarem, quin ad cæteras virtutes humanitatem summam adjunxisses, duxi tibi commendandum esse hunc bonum virum Alexandrum Aleffium Scotum. Is proficiscitur in Britanniam ut exhibeat Reverentiæ tuæ quoddam meum scriptum, in quo R. P. T. animadvertet me conatum esse, ut diligenter et utiliter explicarem, et, quantum possem, *mitigare[m] plerasque*  
"contro-

“ *controversias*. Sed iudicium de toto scripto libenter  
 “ et R. P. et similibus viris doctis et piis permitto,  
 “ a quorum iudicio nunquam in Ecclesia Christi dissen-  
 “ tiam. Itaque si vel studium meum vel scriptum pro-  
 “ babis, rogo, ut R. P. T. adjuvet hunc Alexandrum,  
 “ ut Regiæ Majestati libellum exhibere possit. . . .  
 “ Iudicium vero suum de meo scripto poterit mihi R.  
 “ P. T. per hunc Alexandrum significare.” August. 1535.  
 Epistolarum Libri Lond. p. 521. Perhaps the reader  
 may not dislike to see what passed between Melancthon  
 and the King himself upon the same subject. “ Sere-  
 “ nissime et inclyte Rex,” his Letter commences,  
 “ etsi publicæ quædam causæ impulerunt me, ut scrip-  
 “ tum quoddam meum R. M. T. dedicarem, tamen  
 “ multum me etiam privatim admiratio ingenii tui et  
 “ virtutis movit, ut, hac qualicunque significatione ju-  
 “ dicii mei, studium R. M. T. meum declararem. Dedi-  
 “ gitur libellum huic Alexandro Scoto, viro docto et  
 “ pio, qui virtutem et pietatem tuam mihi et aliis mul-  
 “ tis in Germania magno studio prædicare solitus est.  
 “ Pollicitus est se meum scriptum exhibiturum esse  
 “ R. M. T. Quod ut æquo animo accipiat R. M. T.  
 “ etiam atque etiam, oro. Equidem opto et animum  
 “ meum et scriptum ipsum probari R. M. T. Sed de  
 “ scripto permitto iudicium R. M. T.” Id. p. 489.  
 This letter, written in August, was answered by Henry  
 in the following October. The answer thus begins :  
 “ Quod Christianæ religionis ipsiusque veritatis pro-  
 “ pugnandæ studiosissimum te percepimus, ficeo nomine  
 “ sincerissimo istius tui animi instituto jampridem af-  
 “ ficimur, ut nihil æque in votis habeamus, ac aliquam  
 “ sese offerre occasionem sanctissimos istos tui pectoris  
 “ conatus quacunque nostra opera juvandi et promo-  
 “ vendi. Ad hujus vero nostræ in te dilectionis non  
 “ vulgaris animum, quam maxima nuper accessit ex li-  
 “ teris

“ teris abs te per A. Alefium ad nos datis, quæ etsi tui  
 “ candoris et amicissimi erga nos studii indices essent  
 “ satis locupletes, id tamen non obscuro egregii desti-  
 “ nati muneris testimonio pulcherrimo testari voluisti.  
 “ *Munus certe ex sui ipsius excellentia dignum, quod boni*  
 “ *omnes complectantur, et quod nostro nomini dicatum est*  
 “ *nobis omnium quam maxime, carum et acceptum.* Ob  
 “ igitur istam bene erga nos affectæ voluntatis signifi-  
 “ cationem ingentes, et quantas possumus ex animo  
 “ gratias tibi habemus, persuasumque esse volumus,  
 “ nos rectissime istis tuis et cum Deo conjunctis studiis  
 “ nullo unquam tempore aut loco defuturos esse.”  
 Octob. 1, 1535. Seckendorf. Historia Lutheran. lib. iii.  
 §. 39. Add. b.

Upon some point connected with the compilation of  
 a public creed, Melancthon was consulted by Cranmer  
 in May 1548, through the medium of J. Jonas, Junior,  
 who at that period was resident with the Archbishop  
 in England. This was the precise æra, when our Li-  
 turgy was first in preparation. The letter of Jonas is  
 not extant; but the answer of Melancthon was couched  
 in the following terms.

“ Reverende Domine. Literis, quas Jonæ filius de  
 “ sermone tuo mihi scripsit ante mensem respondi.  
 “ Quo diutius autem de vestra deliberatione, qua nulla  
 “ gravior et magis necessaria in genere humano institui  
 “ potest, cogito, eo magis et opto, et vos adhortandos  
 “ esse censeo, ut de universo doctrinæ corpore edatis  
 “ confessionem veram et perspicuam collatis judiciis  
 “ eruditorum, quorum et nomina adscribantur, ut apud  
 “ omnes gentes extet illustre testimonium de doctrina  
 “ gravi autoritate traditum, et ut posterus normam  
 “ habeat, quam sequatur. Nec vero multum dissimilis  
 “ ea confessio nostræ erit futura, sed paucos quosdam  
 “ articulos velim extare ad posteritatem magis explica-  
 “ tos,

“tos, ne ambiguitates postea occasionem præbeant no-  
 “vis diffidiis. Nunc et a Carolo imperatore propo-  
 “est moderatio controversiarum, quam fortassis editu-  
 “rus est, sed quia conjungere diffidentes conatur, idque  
 “eo modo fieri posse existimat, posita aliqua generali  
 “sententia, quam nemo propter generalitatem rejicere  
 “possit, cothurnos facit, qui novas discordias excitabunt,  
 “et quædam intexit confirmatura abusus. In Ecclesia  
 “rectius est Scapham Scapham dicere, nec objicere  
 “posteris ambigua dicta, ut in fabulis dicitur, pomum  
 “ἐπίδος objectum esse deabus in convivio sedentibus.  
 “Si in Germania nostrarum Ecclesiarum consensus in-  
 “teger fuisset, in has miseras non incidissemus. Magno-  
 “pere igitur te hortor, ut incumbas in hanc curam, et  
 “cogitationem, ut Ecclesiis vere consulatur. Si meum  
 “judicium et suffragium etiam flagitabis, libenter et  
 “audiam alios doctos viros, et dicam ipse sententiam  
 “meo loco, et sententiæ causas ostendam, τὰ μὲν πειθῶν,  
 “τὰ δὲ πειθόμενος, ut decet in colloquio purum. Vincant  
 “autem semper veritas, gloria Dei, et solus Ecclesiæ  
 “non privati affectus ulli.” Epist. libri Lond. Epist. 66.  
 lib. i.

Shortly after, in the same year, Melancthon wrote  
 another letter to Crannier of a similar import, relative  
 to a particular question, upon which likewise he seems  
 to have been consulted. The subject is thus adverted  
 to. “ . . . . Quod cum fecissem, ecce adferuntur filii  
 “Jonæ literæ, in quibus mihi sermonem quendam tuum  
 “narrat de quæstione non obscura, sed quæ duriter  
 “concussit Ecclesiam, et concutiet durius, quia guber-  
 “natores illi tantæ rei non quærunt vera remedia.

“Nihil autem in hac epistola præter meum dolorem  
 “indicare volo, qui tantus est, ut exauriri non possit,  
 “vel, si tantum funderem lacrymarum, quantum vehit  
 “undarum Albis noster, aut apud vos Tamesis. Vi-  
 “des

“ des multiples explicationes et olim excogitatas esse,  
 “ et nunc excogitari, quia negligitur simplex et sincera  
 “ vetustas. Ac longiorem disputationem nunc non eo  
 “ tantum omitto, quia properant tabellarii, sed etiam,  
 “ quia non amo labyrinthos, ut vides omne mecum stu-  
 “ dium in multis materiis fuisse, ut extarent plane  
 “ evoluta.

“ Illud autem te oro, ut deliberes cum viris bonis,  
 “ ac vere doctis, et quod statuendum et qua modera-  
 “ tione initio in dicendo opus sit. Ego optarem, ut in  
 “ priore epistola scripsi, non tantum de hac quæstione,  
 “ sed de quibusdam aliis rebus edi summam necessariæ  
 “ doctrinæ sine privato ullo affectu, deliberatis et ad-  
 “ scriptis suffragiis piorum et doctorum, qui essent ad-  
 “ hibiti ad eam deliberationem, nec relinqui posteris  
 “ ambiguitates, tanquam *μηλον ἑριδος*. Synodus Tri-  
 “ dentina veteratoria decreta facit, ut ambigue dictis  
 “ tueatur suos errores. Hanc sophisticam procul ab  
 “ Ecclesia abesse oportuit. Minimum est absurdi in  
 “ rebus veris recte propositis. Invitaret igitur et re-  
 “ rum bonitas, et perspicuitas ubique bonas mentes.

“ *Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio Stoicæ disputationes  
 “ apud nostros de fato, et disciplinæ nocuerunt. Quare te  
 “ rogo, ut de tali aliqua formula doctrinæ cogites.*” Id.  
 Epist. 44. lib. 3. Although it does not clearly appear  
 to what the particular question in this last epistle re-  
 lated, we may nevertheless conjecture, that it was in  
 some way allied to that of Predestination, from the ex-  
 pressions, “ *qua moderatione initio in dicendo opus sit,*”  
 coupled with the concluding clause.

The project of establishing an authoritative standard  
 of faith, by a general congress of Reformed Divines,  
 had been long a favourite idea with Melancthon. We  
 find him thus alluding to it in the year 1542. “ Quod  
 “ autem sæpe optavi, ut aliquando autoritate seu re-  
 “ gum,

“ gum, seu aliorum piorum principum, convocati viri  
 “ docti de controversiis omnibus libere colloquerentur,  
 “ et relinquerent posteris firmam et perspicuam doctri-  
 “ nam, *idem adhuc opto.*” Preface to his Works, Epi-  
 stolæ Londin. p. 147. The same wish is likewise ex-  
 pressed in the epistle before it, p. 141 and 142. This  
 circumstance, in addition to the obvious drift of the  
 preceding correspondence, proves the mistake of his-  
 torians, in supposing the plan to have originated with  
 Cranmer.

*Page 36, note (7).*

What is here stated may be collected with certainty  
 from the correspondence of Calvin, in which occur  
 two epistles to Cranmer, and both upon this identical  
 proposal. They are without dates, but are arranged  
 by Beza in the year 1551.

“ Tu quidem, illustrissime Domine, vere et pruden-  
 “ ter in hoc tam confuso Ecclesiæ statu nullum aptius  
 “ afferri posse remedium judicas, quam si inter se  
 “ convenient pii cordati, et in Dei schola probe ex-  
 “ ercitati homines, qui suum in pietatis doctrina  
 “ consensum profiteantur.” He then points out the  
 propriety of the undertaking, from the corruptions of  
 Popery, and the ignorance of teachers, and thus pro-  
 ceeds; “ Deinde scio non ita unius Angliæ haberi abs-  
 “ te rationem, quin orbi simul universo consulas. Re-  
 “ gis quoque serenissimi non modo generosa indoles,  
 “ sed rara etiam pietas merito exosculanda, quod  
 “ sanctum consilium de habendo ejusmodi conventu  
 “ favore suo prosequitur, et locum in regno suo offert.  
 “ Atque utinam impetrari posset, ut in locum aliquem  
 “ docti et graves viri ex præcipuis Ecclesiis coirent, ac  
 “ singulis fidei capitibus diligenter excussis, de com-  
 “ muni omnium sententia certam posteris traderent  
 “ scripturæ doctrinam.” Then, after lamenting the  
 divisions

divisions of the reformed, he adds ; “ Quantum ad me  
 “ attinet, si quis mei usus fore videbitur, ne decem qui-  
 “ dem maria, si opus sit, ob eam rem trajicere pigeat ; si  
 “ de juvando tantum Angliæ regno ageretur, jam mihi  
 “ ea satis legitima ratio foret. Nunc cum quærat<sup>r</sup> gra-  
 “ vis, et ad scripturæ normam probe compositus docto-  
 “ rum hominum consensus, qua Ecclesiæ procul alio-  
 “ qui diffitæ inter se coalescant, nullis vel laboribus  
 “ vel molestiis parcere fas mihi esse arbitrör. Verum  
 “ tenuitatem meam facturam spero, ut mihi parcat<sup>r</sup>.  
 “ Si votis prosequar, quod ab aliis susceptum erit,  
 “ partibus meis defunctus ero. D. Philippus (Me-  
 “ lancthon) longius abest, ut ultro citroque commear<sup>e</sup>  
 “ brevi tempore literæ queant. D. Bullingerus tibi  
 “ forte rescripsit. Mihi utinam par studii ardori suppe-  
 “ teret facultas. Porro quod me facturum principio  
 “ negavi, ipsa rei, quam sentis, difficultas tentare me  
 “ cogit ; non ut te horter modo, sed etiam obteſter ad  
 “ pergendum ; donec aliquid saltem effectum fuerit, si  
 “ non omnia ex voto succedant. Vale, &c.” Calvini  
 Epistolæ, p. 100. edit. Gen. 1575.

If this epistle be compared with those quoted in the preceding note, it will be evident, that Cranmer had then just begun to act upon the precise plan, suggested to him by Melancthon three years before.

But this was almost immediately followed by another letter from Calvin, from which it appears, that the project was finally abandoned.

“ Quando hoc tempore minime sperandum fuit,  
 “ quod, quod maxime optandum erat, ut ex diversis  
 “ Ecclesiis, quæ puram Evangelii doctrinam amplexæ  
 “ sunt, convenirent præcipui quique doctores, ac ex  
 “ puro Dei verbo, certam, de singulis capitibus hodie  
 “ controversis, ac dilucidam ad posteros confessionem  
 “ ederint, consilium, quod cœpisti, Reverende Domine,  
 “ vehe-

“vehementer laudo, ut mature *apud se* religionem  
 “Angli constituent, ne diutius rebus incertis vel mi-  
 “nus rite compositis, quam decebat, suspensi hæreant  
 “plebis animi. In quam rem ita omnes, qui guber-  
 “nacula istic tenent, communibus studiis incumbere  
 “oportet, *ut tamen præcipuæ sint tuæ partes*. Vides  
 “quid locus iste postulet, vel magis, quid pro muneris;  
 “quod tibi injunxit, ratione abs te suo jure exigat  
 “Deus. Summa est in te auctoritas, quam non magis  
 “tibi honoris amplitudo conciliat, quam concepta pri-  
 “dem de tua prudentia et integritate opinio. Con-  
 “jecti sunt in te bonæ partis oculi, vel ut tuum mo-  
 “tum sequantur, vel ut cessationis tuæ prætextu tor-  
 “peant. Atque utinam, te duce, *aliquanto longius*  
 “jam ante triennium progressi forent, ne tantum hodie  
 “negotii crassis superstitionibus tollendis, ac certami-  
 “num restaret. Fateor equidem, ex quo serio reflo-  
 “ruit Evangelium in Anglia, intra breve tempus, non  
 “parvas accessiones esse factas. Verum si reputas, et  
 “*quid adhuc desit, et quam nimis fuerit in multis re-*  
 “*bus cessatum*, non est, quod remissius ad metani,  
 “quasi magna stadii parte confecta, properes.” In the  
 concluding part of the letter Calvin censures what he  
 conceived to be the slow progress of our Reformers in  
 extirpating superstition; and endeavours to stimulate  
 the Primate, too tardy in his idea, to stronger mea-  
 sures, and more active exertions. Id. p. 101. anno 1551.

*Page 37, note (°).*

See last Lecture, note 4. Bucer died at Cambridge,  
 Feb. 17, 1551. In the summer of that year the first  
 sketch of the Articles was prepared, but no publication  
 took place till the spring of the year 1553. During  
 the whole of this period, the Professorship alluded to  
 remained vacant, which we ultimately find was in-  
 tended for Melancthon.

—Indeed,



Indeed, after the year 1548, when the persecution in consequence of the Interim took place, which drove Bucer out of Germany, Melancthon himself every day dreaded a similar fate. The probability therefore that he would at length comply with what he knew to be the anxious wish of his best friends in this country, naturally grew stronger, when it was considered, that a public and honourable situation could be given to him; a situation, which would prevent his being contemplated in the light of a mere Pensionary.

That our Reformers were less anxious to have him here in this than in the preceding reign, it is impossible to suppose. And in addition to what has been already observed on that head, we may add what he states to Camerarius in September 1535. “*Ab Anglis bis vocatus sum, sed expecto tertias literas.*” Epist. p. 722. And again, in April 1536; “*Et sic me Angli exercent, vix ut respirare liceat.*” Id. p. 738.

Page 38, note (°).

See note 2.

Page 38, note (1°).

The title of this publication is, “*Responsio venerationis Sacerdotum, Henrici Jolliffe et Roberti Johnson, sub protestatione facta ad illos Articulos Joannis Hooperi, Episcopi Vigorniae, nomen gerentis, in quibus a Catholica fide dissentiebat: Una cum confutationibus ejusdem Hooperi, et replicationibus Reverendissimi in Christo Patris bonae memoriae Stephanus Gardineri, Episcopi Wintoniensis, tunc temporis pro confessione fidei in carcere detenti. Antwerpiae 1564.*” Hooper visited his new diocese of Worcester in July 1552, where he found two Prebendaries of the Cathedral unwilling to subscribe to certain Articles which he proposed, (Strype’s Memorials of Cranmer, Book ii. cap. 18.) with whom he maintained a

public dispute upon the subject. It was one of these Prebendaries, who, in the reign of Elizabeth, published the whole controversy at Antwerp, containing the Articles, the objections to them, with Hooper's answer, and what was considered as a confutation of that answer, by Gardiner.

That the Articles alluded to were the first sketch of those afterwards published by authority, is evident both from their general resemblance, and from the following passages in Hooper's Answer. "*Quæ in Articulos regios scripsisti.*" p. 7. "*Quid hic de regis majestate qui mihi author fuit, ut hæc suis omnibus, tam qui in Clero sunt, quam qui in promiscua multitudine proponerem, suspicamini, aliis divinandum relinquo.*" "*Me vero meique loci et ordinis alios, qui his jam pridem subscripsimus, quo ingenio αἰέσεως nota liberetis, non video, postquam hos Articulos, quos verbo veritatis freti approbavimus, sacræ Scripturæ et Ecclesiæ determinationi vestra censura adversantur.*" p. 9.

Although delivered to the Bishops, and perhaps generally offered for subscription, they were not yet sanctioned by any public authority, as appears from the following letter of Hooper to Cecil, dated July 6, 1552: "For the love of God, cause the Articles, that the King's Majesty spoke of, when we took our oaths, to be set forth by his authority." Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, Append. p. 135.

*Page 39, note (11).*

Besides the five first of our present Articles, with others unconnected with my subject, the 9th, upon Original Sin, the 10th, upon Free Will, and the 17th, upon Predestination, were wanting. In the following note it will be seen, that some of the additional ones, introduced into the work before publication, were derived from the Augsbourg Confession.

*Page*

*Page 40, note (12).*

The first of our Articles was taken almost verbatim from the first of the Augsbourgh Confession.

1st Article.

“Unus est vivus et verus Deus, æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, impassibilis, immensæ potentiae, sapientiae, et bonitatis, creator et conservator omnium, tum visibilium, tum invisibilium. Et in unitate hujus divinæ naturæ tres sunt personæ, ejusdem essentiae, potentiae, ac æternitatis, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.”

Augsbourgh Confession.

“Videlicet, quod sit una essentia divina, quæ et appellatur et est Deus, æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, immensa potentia, sapientia, et bonitate, creator et conservator omnium rerum, visibilium et invisibilium. Et tamen tres sunt personæ, ejusdem essentiae et potentiae, et coæternæ, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.”

The same likewise may be said of our second Article, except of the words, “Ab æterno a Patre genitus, verus et æternus Deus, ac Patri consubstantialis,” which were added in 1562.

2d Article.

“Filius, qui est verbum Patris in utero beatæ Virginis, ex illius substantia naturam humanam assumpsit, ita ut duæ naturæ, divina et humana, integre atque perfecte in unitate personæ fuerint inseparabiliter conjunctæ, ex quibus est unus Christus, verus Deus et verus homo, qui vere passus est, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus, ut Patrem nobis reconciliaret, essetque hostia non tantum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis.”

## Augsbourgh Confession.

“ Item docent, quod verbum, hoc est, Filius Dei,  
 “ assumperit humanam naturam in utero beatæ Mariæ  
 “ Virginis, ut sint duæ naturæ, divina et humana, in u-  
 “ nitate personæ inseparabiliter conjunctæ, unus Chris-  
 “ tus, vere Deus et vere homo, natus ex virgine Maria,  
 “ vere passus, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus, ut re-  
 “ conciliaret nobis Patrem, et hostia esset non tantum  
 “ pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus actua-  
 “ libus hominum peccatis.” Art. 3.

The 9th Article evidently kept the same Confession, although more remotely, in view.

## 9th Article.

“ Peccatum originis non est ut fabulantur Pelagiani,  
 “ . . . . . sed est vitium et depravatio naturæ cujuslibet  
 “ hominis ex Adamo naturaliter propagati . . . . unde  
 “ in unoquoque nascentium iram Dei atque damnatio-  
 “ nem meretur. . . . . Peccati tamen in sese rationem  
 “ habere concupiscentiam fatetur Apostolus.”

## Augsbourgh Confession.

“ Item docent, quod post lapsum Adæ omnes ho-  
 “ mines secundum naturam propagati, nascantur cum  
 “ peccato, hoc est, sine metu Dei, sine fiducia erga  
 “ Deum, et cum concupiscentia, quodque hic morbus  
 “ seu vitium originis vere sit peccatum, damnans, et  
 “ afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem his, qui non  
 “ renascantur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum.  
 “ Damnant Pelagianos, et alios, qui vitium originis  
 “ negant esse peccatum.” Art. 2.

The 16th likewise was principally derived from the same source.

## 16th Article.

“ . . . . . Post acceptum Spiritum Sanctum, possumus  
 “ a gratia data recedere atque peccare, denuoque per  
 “ gratiam

“ gratiam Dei resurgere ac resipiscere. Ideoque illi  
 “ damnandi sunt, qui se, quamdiu hic vivant, amplius  
 “ non posse peccare affirmant, aut vere resipiscentibus  
 “ pœnitentiæ locum denegant.”

Augsboursgh Confession.

“ Damnant Anabaptistas, qui negant semel justifica-  
 “ tos iterum posse amittere Spiritum Sanctum. Item,  
 “ qui contendunt, quibusdam tantam perfectionem in  
 “ hac vita contingere, ut peccare non possint. Dam-  
 “ nantur et Novitiani, qui nolebant absolvere lapsos  
 “ post baptismum redeuntes ad pœnitentiam.” Art. 11.  
 The 25th, 26th, and 34th, have already been alluded  
 to in note 6 of the preceding Lecture.

The last which I shall particularize is the

31st Article.

“ Oblatio Christi semel facta perfecta est redemptio,  
 “ propitiatio, et satisfactio, pro omnibus peccatis to-  
 “ tius mundi, tam originalibus, quam actualibus. . . .”

Augsboursgh Confession.

“ Passio Christi fuit oblatio et satisfactio, non solum  
 “ pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis  
 “ peccatis.” De Missa.

Besides these, however, it should be added, that the  
 39th, proving the Resurrection to be not yet past, the  
 41st, against the supporters of a Millenium, and the  
 42d, against the doctrine of Origen respecting the  
 final salvation of all men, (which were omitted in  
 1562,) were all clearly suggested by the 17th of the  
 Augsboursgh Confession.

*Page 40, note (13).*

Archbishop Parker was the editor of the early His-  
 torians of England, and some valuable Saxon manu-  
 scripts. His *Antiquitates Britannicæ* is well known.  
 See his life in the *Biographica Britannica*.

Page 41, note (<sup>14</sup>).

Strype, in his *Annals of the Reformation under Elizabeth*, (p. 288.) gives the particulars of this MS. preserved among Parker's other papers in Bennet College Library, Cambridge. While the alterations, emendations, &c. of Edward's Articles appear to be inserted in the Archbishop's own hand-writing, the signatures exhibit the autographs of the respective members of the Convocation. A complete and critical account of the same document is likewise given in Bennet's *Essay on the XXXIX Articles*, chapters 4, 5, and 6.

The original records of the proceedings in Convocation at this interesting period, perished in the memorable fire of London. The following short summary, however, has been preserved.

“ Et ulterius proposuit, quod *Articuli in Synodo Londinensi, tempore nuper regis Edwardi sexti editi, traditi sint quibusdam aliis viris in cœtu dictæ domus inferioris, ad hoc etiam electis, ut eos diligenter perspiciant, examinent, et considerent, ut prout iis visum fuerit, corrigant et reformed, ac in proxima sessione etiam exhibeant. Et tunc Reverendissimus hujusmodi negotia per dictum Prolocutorem et Clerum incepta approbavit; ac in eisdem erga prox. sessionem, juxta eorum determinationem procedere voluit et mandavit.*

“ De hisce Articulis sacrosanctam Christi religionem concernentibus, 20, 22, 25, 27 diebus mensis Januarii, tam in Ecclesia D. Pauli Londin. domo capitulari, præmissis semper precibus, tractatum fuit, donec 29 die ejusdem mensis, tandem super quibusdam Articulis Orthodoxæ fidei inter Episcopos, quorum nomina eis subscribuntur, unanimiter convenit.” *Concilia Magnæ Britanniae*, vol. iv. p. 232 and 233.

Page

*Page 43, note (15).*

The Articles, either partly, or wholly, copied from the Wirtemberg Confession, are the 2d, 5th, 6th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 20th; which, indeed, contain the principal additions and elucidations upon doctrinal points, (that of the Eucharist alone excepted,) adopted at that period.

2d Article.

“ Ab æterno a Patre genitus, verus et æternus Deus,  
“ ac Patri confubstantialis.”

Wirtemberg Confession.

“ Credimus et confitemur Filium Dei, Dominum  
“ nostrum Jefum Christum, ab æterno a Patre suo ge-  
“ nitum, verum et æternum Deum, Patri suo confub-  
“ stantialem.” Art. de Filio Dei.

5th Article.

“ De Spiritu Sancto.

“ Spiritus Sanctus, a Patre et Filio procedens, ejus-  
“ dem est cum Patre et Filio essentia, majestatis, et  
“ gloriæ, verus ac æternus Deus.”

Wirtemberg Confession.

“ De Spiritu Sancto.

“ Credimus et confitemur Spiritum Sanctum ab æ-  
“ terno procedere a Deo Patre et Filio, et esse ejusdem  
“ cum Patre et Filio essentia, majestatis, et gloriæ, ve-  
“ rum ac æternum Deum.”

6th Article.

“ . . . . . Sacræ Scripturæ nomine eos Canonicos li-  
“ bros veteris et novi Testamenti intelligimus, de quo-  
“ rum auctoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est.”

Wirtemberg Confession.

“ De Sacra Scriptura.

“ Sacram Scripturam vocamus eos Canonicos libros  
“ veteris et novi Testamenti, de quorum autoritate in  
“ Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est.”

## 10th Article.

“Ea est hominis post lapsum Adæ conditio, ut sese,  
 “naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus, ad fidem  
 “et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare non  
 “possit.”

Wirtemberg Confession.

## “De Peccato.

“Quod autem nonnulli affirmant homini post lap-  
 “sum tantam animi integritatem relictam, ut possit  
 “sese, naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus, ad fi-  
 “dem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare,  
 “haud obscure pugnat cum Apostolica doctrina, et  
 “cum vero Ecclesiæ Catholicæ consensu.”

## 11th Article.

“Tantum propter meritum Domini ac Servatoris  
 “nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera et  
 “merita nostra, iusti coram Deo reputamur.”

Wirtemberg Confession.

## “De Justificatione.

“Homo enim fit Deo acceptus, et reputatur coram  
 “eo iustus, propter solum Filium Dei, Dominum nos-  
 “trum Jesum Christum, per fidem.”

Id. “De Evangelio Christi.

“Nec veteris nec novi Testamenti hominibus con-  
 “tingat æterna salus propter meritum operum Legis,  
 “sed tantum propter meritum Domini nostri Jesu  
 “Christi, per fidem.”

## 12th Article.

“Bona opera, quæ sunt fructus fidei, et iustificatos  
 “sequuntur, quanquam peccata nostra expiare, et di-  
 “vini iudicii severitatem ferre non possunt, Deo tamen  
 “grata sunt, et accepta in Christo. . . . .”

Wirtemberg Confession.

## “De bonis Operibus.

“Non est autem sentiendum, quod iis bonis operi-  
 “bus,



“bus, quæ per nos facimus, in iudicio Dei, ubi agitur  
 “de expiatione peccatorum, et placatione divinæ iræ,  
 “ac merito æternæ salutis, confidendum sit. Omnia  
 “enim bona opera, quæ nos facimus, sunt imperfecta,  
 “nec possunt severitatem divini iudicii ferre.”

20th Article.

“Habet Ecclesia ritus sive ceremonias statuendi jus,  
 “et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem. . . .”

Wirtemberg Confession.

“De Ecclesia.

“Credimus et confitemur quod . . . hæc Ecclesia  
 “habeat jus iudicandi de omnibus doctrinis, juxta il-  
 “lud, *Probate Spiritus, num ex Deo sint* ; et, *Cæteri di-*  
 “*judicent.*”

“Quod hæc Ecclesia habeat jus interpretandæ Scrip-  
 “turæ.”

The last passage quoted from the 20th Article, is the celebrated clause, which was formerly the subject of much controversy. It was certainly not in the Articles of 1552. The question is, was it inserted, or not, by authority, in the revision under Elizabeth ? That it was, does not its similarity to the clause of the Wirtemberg Confession, with which I have contrasted it, furnish additional proof, when it is considered, that the principal of the other augmentations then adopted by the Convocation were manifestly derived from that Confession ?

*Page 43, note (16).*

“Res in eo tum statu erant, ut nobis peculiaris con-  
 “fessio conscribenda, et Tridentino Conventui exhiben-  
 “da esset, qua tamen tantum abest, ut ab Augustana  
 “confessione recefferimus, ut eam potius compendio  
 “quodam complecti et repetere voluerimus.” Præf. Du-  
 eis Wirtemb. The Wirtemberg Confession was composed

in,

in 1551, and in the following year exhibited by the Wirtemberg Ambassadors in the Council of Trent.

Page 46, note (<sup>17</sup>).

So little known was the fame of Calvin in England about this period, that one of his works was translated, and published in 1549, under the following title; “Of the Life and Conversation of a Christian Man; a right godly treatise, written in the Latin tongue, by Master John Calvin, *a man of right excellent learning, and of no less conversation.*” Ames’s Topographical Antiquities, p. 620. ed. W. H. Does not this encomium prove, that his name, in consequence, if not of its obscurity, at least of its little celebrity, stood in need of some commendation? How differently is Luther’s announced in the following work, of rather an earlier period (viz. about the year 1547)! “The Disclosing of the Canon of the Popish Mass. With a Sermon annexed, of the famous Clerk of worthy memory, Dr. Martin Luther.” See Strype’s Eccles. Mem. vol. ii. p. 28.

Indeed in this very year it was, that Calvin first freed himself from the suspicion of being a Lutheran in the doctrine of the Eucharist, by subscribing to an agreement with the Zuinglians; “Cæterum,” observes Beza in his life of Calvin, “hoc Ecclesiis Germanicis inflicto vulnus contrario beneficio Dominus apud Helvetios compensavit; Farello simul ac Calvino Tigurum profectis: ut, cum visus esset quibusdam Calvinus Consubstantiationi nonnihil favere, de communi in ea re omnium Helveticarum Ecclesiarum consensu omnibus liqueret.” Anno 1549. The concord, which, in consequence of this visit to Zurich, took place between the Pastors of Geneva and the Zuinglians, was attacked by J. Westphal, a Lutheran, in 1552. Mosheim’s

them's Ecclesiastical History, vol. iv. p. 71. Calvin, however, did not answer his opponent, until the years 1556 and 1557. When the word Calvinist first became general, in the sense alluded to, I have not been able precisely to ascertain. Fox, I have remarked, does not use it. Evidently however in 1585, if not before, it was thus applied by Saunders to Cranmer, who, in the Book of Martyrs, is termed a Zuinglian, and not a Calvinist. *De Schismate Anglicano*, p. 116.

*Page 47, note (18).*

At the close of the year 1551, commenced his first public controversy upon the doctrine of Predestination. "The opposition," observes Mosheim, "which was made to Calvin, did not end here. He had contests of another kind to sustain against those, who could not relish his theological system, and more especially his melancholy and discouraging doctrine in relation to eternal and absolute decrees. These adversaries felt, by a disagreeable experience, the warmth and violence of his haughty temper, and that impatience of contradiction, that arose from an over-zealous concern for his honour, or rather for his unrivalled supremacy. He would not suffer them to remain at Geneva; nay, in the heat of the controversy, being carried away by the impetuosity of his passions, he accused them of crimes, from which they have been fully absolved by the impartial judgment of unprejudiced posterity. Among these victims of Calvin's unlimited power and excessive zeal, we may reckon Sebastian Castellio, master of the public school at Geneva, who, though not exempt from failings, was nevertheless a man of probity, and was also remarkable for the extent of his learning, and the elegance of his taste. . . . A like fate happened to Jerome Bolsec. . . . His imprudence, however, was great, and

“and was the principal cause of the misfortunes that  
 “befel him. It led him, in the year 1551, to lift up  
 “his voice in the full congregation, after the conclusion  
 “of divine worship, and to declaim, in the most inde-  
 “cent manner, against the doctrine of absolute de-  
 “crees; for which he was cast into prison, and soon  
 “after sent into banishment.” Mosheim, vol. iv. p.  
 124 and 125.

To prevent the suspicion of quoting a partial authority, I shall give an account of the first public dissen-  
 sion upon the point under consideration, as recorded by  
 Calvin himself and his associates. A circular letter on  
 the occasion was written by the ministers of Geneva,  
 to the different Helvetian Churches. In this the  
 transaction is thus alluded to: “Est hic Hieronymus  
 “quidam, qui, abjecta Monachi cuculla, unus ex cir-  
 “cumforaneis medicis factus est, qui fallendo et frus-  
 “trando tantum sibi impudentiæ acquirunt, ut ad  
 “quidvis audiendum prompti sint ac parati. Is jam an-  
 “te octo menses in publico Ecclesiæ nostræ cœtu doc-  
 “trinam de gratuita Dei electione, quam ex verbo Dei  
 “acceptam vobiscum docemus, labefactare conatus est.  
 “Ac tunc quidem, quæ fieri potuit moderatione, sedata  
 “fuit hominis protervia. Postea non destitit locis om-  
 “nibus obstrepere, ut simplicibus hoc fidei caput excu-  
 “teret, tandem virus suum nuper aperto gutture evo-  
 “muit. Nam cum pro more nostro unus e fratribus  
 “illum Johannis locum exponeret, ubi pronunciat  
 “Christus ex Deo non esse, qui verba Dei non au-  
 “diunt, dixissetque, quotquot Spiritu Dei renati, non  
 “sunt perveraciter usque in finem Deo resistere; quia  
 “peculiare sit obedientiæ donum, quo Deus suos elec-  
 “tos dignatur; surrexit nebulo ille, ac dixit, *falsam*  
 “*et impiam opinionem, cujus auctor fuit Laurentius Val-*  
 “*la, nostro seculo exortam esse, quod Dei voluntas rerum*  
 “*omnium*

“ *omnium sit causa. Hoc autem modo peccata et malorum*  
 “ *omnium culpam in Deum transcribi, et illi affingi ty-*  
 “ *rannicam libidinem, qualem poetæ veteres in suo Jove*  
 “ *commenti sunt. Postea ad alterum caput descendit, non*  
 “ *ideo salutem consequi homines, quia electi sunt, sed ideo*  
 “ *eligi, quia credunt; nec reprobari quenquam nudo Dei*  
 “ *placito, sed eos tantum, qui se communi electione pri-*  
 “ *vant. In hac quæstione agitanda, multis et atrocibus*  
 “ *convitiis in nos invehitur est. Præfectus urbis, re au-*  
 “ *dita, eum duxit in carcerem, præsertim quia tumultu-*  
 “ *ose plebem hortatus fuerat, ne se decipi a nobis*  
 “ *fineret.” Inter Calvini Epistolæ, p. 104. ed. 1575. Beza,*  
 “ *in his life of Calvin, anno 1551, gives the exact*  
 “ *dates of these transactions: “ Palam ausus est in ipso*  
 “ *congregationis cœtu decimo sexto Octobris. . . . Ade-*  
 “ *rat in ipso audientium cœtu Affessorum Prætoris*  
 “ *unus, quorum in urbe jus prehensionis est. Is illum,*  
 “ *dimisso cœtu, tanquam seditiosum in custodiam tra-*  
 “ *dit. Quid plura? Causa, multis disputationibus agi-*  
 “ *tata, senatus Helveticarum etiam Ecclesiarum sen-*  
 “ *tentiam percontatus, illum, tum ut seditiosum, tum*  
 “ *ut mere Pelagianum, vicesimo secundo Decembris pub-*  
 “ *lice damnatum urbe expulit.”*

Calvin, in consequence of this dispute, almost immediately drew up his first tract upon Predestination, under the title of “ *De Æterna Dei Prædestinatione,*” which was published in January 1552. In the preface of this work, he thus speaks of Bolsec’s tenets: “ *As-*  
 “ *serit fidem ab electione non pendere, quia potius electio-*  
 “ *nem esse in fide sitam: nullos in cæcitate manere ob in-*  
 “ *genitam naturæ corruptionem, quia rite omnes illumi-*  
 “ *nentur a Deo; nos Deo facere injuriam, quia deserui-*  
 “ *tradimus quos Spiritus sui illuminatione non dignatur:*  
 “ *trahi generaliter et ex æquo omnes homines, nec disci-*  
 “ *men nisi a contumacia incipere: quum Deus se ex lapi-*  
 “ *deis*

“*deis cordibus cornea facturum promittit, nihil aliud in-*  
 “*telligi, quam ut gratiæ Dei simus capaces, idque pro-*  
 “*miscue ad totum genus humanum extendi, quam singu-*  
 “*lare Ecclesiæ privilegium esse Scriptura dilucide affir-*  
 “*met.*” *Opuscula*, p. 949. ed. 1576.

With respect to the opinions imputed to Bolsec, they seem to have differed but little, if at all, from those of the Lutherans. Indeed, he directly appealed to the authority of Melancthon; a circumstance, to which Calvin himself alludes in the following letter to that Reformer: “Referam, quid nobis, in hac Ecclesia, summo piorum hominum cruciatu acciderit. Ac jam annus integer elapsus est, ex quo inter has pugnas jactamur. Quidam nebulones, quum nobis de grata Dei electione, et misera humani arbitrii servitute, litem moverent, et publice tumultuarentur, nihil ad nos gravandos habuerunt magis plausibile nominis tui prætextu. Quum experti essent, quam nobis promptum esset, quæcunque ingerebant, commenta refellere, hoc scilicet artificio nos obruere tentabant, nisi vellemus palam abs te discedere. Et ea quidem servata fuit a nobis moderatio, ut minime extorserint, quod astuti captabant. *Professi ergo sumus ego et collegæ omnes mei eundem, quo tendis, in doctrina scopum nobis esse propositum. Nec verbum in tota disceptatione excedit, vel in te minus honorificum, quam par erat, vel quod tibi fidem detraheret. Nec tamen fieri potest, quin me interea vehementer urat tacita ista cogitatio; improbis post mortem nostram vexandæ Ecclesiæ occasionem, quoties libuerit, relinqui, dum pugnantes eorum sententias in certamen committent, quos velut uno ore unum idemque loqui decuerat.*” Dated December 1552. *Epist. Calv.* p. 108.

The consequences of this attack upon Calvin's theory of Predestination are thus recorded by Beza:

“Anno

“Anno vero deinceps secuto, (1552) magis apparuit  
 “*quantam flammam accendisset impurus ille, licet com-*  
 “*muni tot Ecclesiæ judicio damnatus. Etenim tum*  
 “*ipsa quæstionis nondum satis a plerisque veteribus expli-*  
 “*catæ, nec eodem semper exitu agitatæ, difficultas curiosa*  
 “*præsertim ingenia ad hoc ipsum disquirendum accen-*  
 “*debat, tum factiosi præclaram sibi oblatam occasio-*  
 “*nem ad omnia, Calvinò ejecto, subvertenda puta-*  
 “*bant. Itaque dici non potest, quæ non in urbe tantum,*  
 “*verum etiam ultro citroque, veluti si classicum ipse Satàn*  
 “*cecinnisset, contentiones sint consecutæ. Et si enim pul-*  
 “*chre inter præcipuarum Ecclesiarum pastores conve-*  
 “*niebat, non deerant tamen, qui in vicinis Bernensis*  
 “*ditionis Ecclesiis Calvinò litem intenderent, quasi*  
 “*Deum faceret peccati autorem, parum certe memo-*  
 “*res hoc ipsum pestilentissimum dogma fuisse a Cal-*  
 “*vino jam pridem ex professo adversus libertinos refu-*  
 “*tatum. . . . . Neque hæc fuit paucorum annorum con-*  
 “*troversia.”* Vita Calvinì, ann. 1552.

Beza likewise remarks, that S. Castellio, whom he ironically terms, “bonus ille et simplex homo,” at that time began plainly to defend Pelagianism, and Melancthon, to point out the Reformers of Geneva as the introducers of a Stoical fate; “Genevenses Stoicum cum fatum invehentes notare;” circumstances, he adds, which poignantly affected Calvin; “Pungebant ista gravissime, sicuti par erat, illius animum, et eo quidem acerbius, quod ea fuit interdum per id tempus erroris efficacia, ut publica etiam auctoritate alicubi obstructum os veritati videretur.” It may be here necessary to remark, that Beza was incorrect, when he stated, that Melancthon first began in the year 1552 obliquely to censure the Stoicism of Calvin, because these expressions in the Loci Theologici, “Studiofi satis perspicue intelligent nequaquam Stoicas opi-

“niones in Ecclesiam invehendas esse,” to which he seems to allude, certainly occur in an edition of the year 1545. An earlier edition (of the corrected work) I have not been able to meet with. Another inaccuracy in his account it is likewise proper to notice. He speaks of a complete concord among the ministers of the principal Helvetian Churches upon the point in dispute; “Eti,” are his words, “*pulchre* inter præcipuarum “Ecclesiarum pastores conveniebat.” Now it appears by a letter of Turretin, addressed to Archbishop Wake in the year 1727, and inserted in the *Acta Eruditorum*, Supp. t. vii. sect. 3. that this supposed agreement was by no means general. Turretin remarks, (and he consulted on the occasion the original documents preserved at Geneva,) that with the answer of Bullinger from Zurich Calvin was by no means satisfied; “Calvin ne fut pas content de cette lettre; il s’en plaignit à Bullinger, qui tâcha de se justifier; mais en se tenant toujours à des termes fort généraux, et à des excuses fort vagues. Licet vero, dit-il, in causa “Hieronymiana non per omnia *volis tuis* responderim, “ideo tamen non odi.” *Bibliothèque Germanique*, (in which Turretin’s letter is likewise published,) vol. xiii. p. 208. The answers of the ministers of Bern and Basle were equally moderate with those of Bullinger, and probably equally unsatisfactory to Calvin; at least we may conceive, that the following assertion of Universal Grace, as expressed in the answer from Basil, could not be very pleasing to him: “Verbum illud “mittitur per mundum universum. Vult enim Deus “omnes homines salvos fieri, et ad agnitionem veritatis venire. Communis est Deus omnium. *Communis est Christus Servator omnium.*” Ibid.

So far indeed was Calvin’s system at that period from obtaining universal approbation in Switzerland, that in the



the year 1555, a combination, or what Beza calls a faction, of some neighbouring ministers was formed against him : “ Aliud denique Calvinum hujus anni (1555) folidum gaudium gaudere prohibuit, *paucorum* videlicet vicinorum pastorum factio, qui sponte alioqui currentes, Bolsecus præterea instigante, ut sibi nomen aliud quod ex tanti viri reprehensione quærerent, homines alioqui multis jam notis aspersi, non aliter in eum debacchabantur, quam si Deum idcirco faceret malorum auctorem, quod ab æterna Dei providentia et ordinatione nihil excluderet.” But let us hear a less prejudiced Calvinist upon the same transaction : “ Les années suivantes il y eut diverses contestations dans le canton de Berne, sur les matieres de la Prédestination. *Plusieurs* ministres” (Beza calls them a few) “ s’y déclarerent contre le sentiment de Calvin, et l’accuserent de faire Dieu auteur du péché. Cela obligea Messieurs de Geneve de députer à Berne ; et Calvin fut un des députez. Mais Messieurs de Berne ne voulurent prendre aucun parti sur ces disputes. Ils dirent simplement qu’ils exhorteroient leurs ministres à parler avec retenue de ces matieres ; et ils exhorterent aussi les Genevois à parler peu et avec beaucoup de circonspection de matieres relevées, comme la Prédestination, dont la connoissance n’est point nécessaire au salut, et qui ne sont propres qu’à engendrer des doutes : Que ce n’est point aux hommes à pénétrer dans les secrets de Dieu : Que plus on y veut creuser, plus on les trouve impénétrables : Qu’ils ne vouloient approuver ni condamner les écrits et la doctrine de Calvin, mais qu’ils vouloient empêcher, que l’on ne disputât dans leur pais sur ces matieres.” *Bibliothèque Germanique*, vol. xiii. p. 116. Turretin adds, that edicts were promulged in the canton of Berne, conformable with this declaration.

Castellio, who, at the time under consideration, resided in Basle, was ranked by Beza among Calvin's opponents upon this subject, so early as in 1552. It was not, however, until the year 1554, that Calvin publicly attacked him, in a short treatise replete with invective, as the supposed author of two offensive tracts against the Predestination of the Genevan school, which Castellio himself declared (*Opuscula*, p. 343.) that he had never seen. This distinguished scholar and amiable man, whom Beza sneeringly characterizes as "quadam ταπεινοφροσύνης specie ineptissime ambitiosus, "ac plane ex eorum genere, quos Græci *ἰδιογνώμονας* "appellant," (*Vita Calvini*, anno 1544,) was particularly patronised by Calvin at Geneva; but having the resolution publicly to differ from that Reformer upon two points, viz. respecting the inspiration of Solomon's Song, and the descent of Christ into hell, (*Opuscula*, p. 353,) he was obliged to quit Geneva in the year 1544, and resided at Basil, in the capacity of Greek Professor, at the time alluded to. The modesty of his defence against the calumnies of his opponent was remarkable. He had been termed, "Blasphemum, calumniatorem, "malignum, canem latrantem, plenum ignorantiae et "bestialitatis, plenum impudentiae, impostorem, sacram literarum impurum corruptorem, impudentem, "impurum canem, impium, obscenum, torti perversique ingenii, vagum balatronem." After recounting these opprobrious epithets, he adds, "Nihil tam tecum est, quod non sit detegendum. *Non semper pen-* "debit inter latrones Christus: resurget aliquando crucifixæ veritas. Sed tu vides etiam atque etiam, ut "possis tot convitiis, quæ in eum, pro quo mortuus est Christus, concessisti, reddere rationem Deo. "Etiam si ego tam ista omnia forem, quam non sum, "tamen dedecet hominem tam doctum, tot hominum

"docto-

“doctorem, tam excellens ingenium demergere in tam  
“fordida fœdaque convitia.” *Opuscula*, p. 344, 345.

Upon the whole, it is evident, that in the year 1552, when our Articles were compiled, the Calvinistical controversy, as it has since been generally termed, was only commencing; and that then Calvin published his first work professedly upon the subject, of which Beza remarks, “hoc unum istis diffidiis consecuto  
“Satana, ut caput hoc Christianæ religionis *antea obscurissimum* dilucidum perspicuumque cunctis non contentiosis evaserit.” *Vita Calv.* It is likewise evident, that at the same period the doctrine alluded to was not universally approved even in Switzerland; and that, according to the testimony of Beza himself, such was then the efficacy of error, or, in other words, the attachment to a contrary system, that the mouth of truth, or the preaching of absolute Predestination, was, at that time, somewhere (probably he meant in the canton of Berne) obstructed by public authority; and that the consideration of this deeply affected Calvin, particularly when he perceived Castellio and Melancthon both adverse to his opinions.

*Page 47, note (19).*

Decretum quidem horribile fateor; inficiari tamen nemo poterit, quin præciverit Deus quem exitum esset habiturus homo, antequam ipsum conderet, et ideo præciverit, quia decreto suo sic ordinarat. *Institut. lib. iii. cap. 23. sect. 7.*

*Page 47, note (20).*

If Calvin's system had been adopted by our Reformers, never surely would they have inserted among our Articles that of Christ's descent into hell, which seems to have been directly levelled against one of his peculiar opinions, and one which he thought of sufficient importance to make a difference of sentiment upon it

a principal ground for the expulsion of his friend Castellio from Geneva. Castell. Opuscula, p. 353. As this Article stood in the reign of Edward, it was impossible to mistake its application, for it then contained the following clause, afterwards omitted: "Nam corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepultura jacuit: spiritus ab illo emissus, cum spiritibus, qui in carcere sive in inferno detinebantur, fuit, illisque prædicavit quemadmodum testatur Petri locus." This circumstance, however, is only incidentally alluded to: much stronger proof is not wanting.

But modern Calvinists, in opposition to the most convincing testimonies, are fond of supposing, that our Liturgy, as well as Articles, was formed upon a Calvinistical model. From an answer however of Beza to an adversary of Calvin, it appears, that *he* at least would have esteemed this supposition no compliment. It had been incorrectly asserted, that Bucer was the author of our Baptismal Service. The reply is thus worded: "Quod ad illam Anglicanam Reformationem attinet, quum dicis eam ex Buceri consilio ac voluntate fuisse institutam, *magnum optimo viro injuriam facis*, qui cum in illo regno versaretur, propagati illic Evangelii initio, dici non potest, quot et quam gravibus gemitibus inter cætera deploravit disciplinæ et puritatis rituum in constituendis illis Ecclesiis majorem rationem non haberi. Imo etiam non pigebit, ut de tuo mendacio melius appareat, quædam ascribere ex ipsius literis ad hominem amicissimum Cantabrigiæ scriptis 12 Jan. 1550. in quibus hæc etiam scribit: 'Quod me mones de puritate rituum, *scito hic neminem extraneum de his rebus rogari*. Tamen ex nobis ubi possumus, officio nostro non desumus scriptis et coram ac in primis, ut plebibus Christi de veris pastoribus consulatur, deinde etiam

de

‘de puritate purissima et doctrinæ et rituum.’ Et  
 “alio loco; ‘Sunt qui, humanissima sapientia et eva-  
 nescentibus cogitationibus, velint fermento Antichri-  
 sti congelutinare Deum et Belial.’ Hæc ille, Balduine,  
 paulo ante mortem scripsit, *nedum ut illa forma An-  
 glicana acquieverit, cujus illum authorem falso et impu-  
 denter facis.*” Bezæ Tractationes Theologicæ, vol. ii.  
 P. 323.

The real fact indeed, with respect to the little influ-  
 ence either of Bucer’s or Martyr’s sentiments in the  
 revision of our Liturgy, seems to have been put be-  
 yond all controversy by G. Ridley, in his Life of Bi-  
 shop Ridley; and that by a reference to indisputable  
 testimonies. He observes, p. 333, 334; “A review  
 of it was therefore determined; and many things  
 were thought proper to be altered. Bucer and Mar-  
 tyr were desired to give their opinions also, as ap-  
 pears by a letter from Martyr to Bucer, Jan. 10,  
 1551; in which we see, that these foreigners in ge-  
 neral agreed in censuring the same things. But  
 they had no further hand in the alterations, than in  
 delivering their censures separately to the Archbi-  
 shop; for in the same letter Martyr says, *that what  
 the points were, that it had been agreed should be al-  
 tered, he knew not, nor durst presume to ask.* And as  
 for Bucer, he died the latter end of the month, and  
 could be no further concerned in it. And as the  
 reviewers were not moved by them, but by some  
 members of the Convocation, *so many alterations were  
 agreed, before these Professors were consulted, as ap-  
 pears from the same letter.*”

With regard to Peter Martyr, so far was he from  
 attempting to dictate upon any point in this kingdom,  
 that we find him thus modestly and submissively ad-  
 dressing himself to Cranmer, in the preface of his tract

upon the Eucharist, published in London, anno 1550. After a high eulogy upon the Archbishop, he adds ; “ Quamobrem non opus fuit, ut meum hunc libellum “ eo consilio tibi exhiberem, ut ex eo aliquid novi “ cognosceres, (*cum ego potius majorem doctrinæ partem “ ex tuis laboribus hauserim,*) sed tantum, ob id ad tuam “ celsitudinem hoc meum scriptum destinavi, quo tua “ censura (cum jure et merito sis Primas totius Angliæ) de illo statueres, *notaresque in eo quicquid a “ recto et orthodoxo sensu visum fuerit dissentire ;* utque “ auctoritate tua (quæ, veluti est, ita summo loco haberi debet) ea protegeres, tuereris, atque defenderes, “ *quæ judicaveris divinis literis consona, et cum regis majestatis editis pulchre convenire.*” And yet in so high a repute have some supposed the credit of this divine to have been with our Reformers, that they have construed the bare circumstance of his being favoured with an asylum in this country, into an approbation of the doctrine of Predestination, which they conceived him to have publicly maintained. As well might they have construed the extension of the same favour to his friend Bern. Ochin (who came over with him) into an approbation of the doctrine of Polygamy ; for as Ochin had not yet written upon the latter, so had not Martyr upon the former subject ; his only publication of any kind at that period having been an exposition of the Apostles’ Creed in Italian, composed when he first abjured the errors of Popery. *Vitæ Theolog. Exter. p. 56.* But it is likewise certain, that both immediately before and after his arrival here, the sentiments of Cranmer were completely at variance with his, upon one of the most important topics of the day ; viz. the Sacramental presence.

Page 48, note (2<sup>1</sup>).

“ *Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio Stoicæ disputationes*  
“ *apud*

“*apud nostros de fato, et disciplinæ nocuerunt.*” Melanct. Epist. lib. iii. epist. 44.

At the commencement of the Reformation, both Melancthon and Luther held the harsh doctrine of a Philosophical Necessity. To this the former alludes in his letter to Cranmer, from which the above passage is taken. See it quoted at length, note 6. After the Diet of Augsbourg in the year 1530, the obnoxious tenet was no more heard of. Indeed, so early as in 1527, these Reformers appear to have abandoned it; at least, when in that year a form of doctrine was drawn up for the Churches of Saxony, Free Will in acts of morality was thus inculcated: “*Voluntas humana est ita libera, ut facere aliquo modo possit justitiam carnis seu justitiam civilem, ubi lege et vi cogitur, ut non furari, non occidere, non mœchari. . . . Propterea doceant, in nostra manu aliquo modo esse carnem frænare, et civilem justitiam præstare; et hortentur diligenter ad recte vivendum, quia Deus hanc quoque justitiam exigit, et graviter puniet illos, qui adeo negligenter vivunt. Nam sicut aliis donis Dei bene uti debemus, ita etiam viribus, quos Deus naturæ tribuit, bene uti debemus.*” Cap. de Libero Arbitrio. “*Non enim delectatur Deus ista vitæ ferocitate quorundam, qui cum audierint non justificari nos viribus et operibus, somniant se velle expectare, a Deo donec trahantur, interea vivunt impiorissime; hi maximas penas dabant Deo. Sunt igitur valde objurgandi a decemcentibus in Ecclesia.*” Cap. de Lege. Articuli suspicionis Ecclesiarum Saxoniae. Edition of 1530. This work, which is generally termed, “*Libellus Visitationis Saxon.*” was composed by Melancthon in German the year alluded to, and afterwards republished by Luther, with a preface, in which he thus expresses himself: “*Non edimus hæc ut præcepta rigorosa, nec*” Pontii-

“ Pontificia decreta denuo cudimus, sed historica et  
 “ acta referimus, *et confessionem et symbolum fidei nos-*  
 “ *træ.*” See Seckendorf, lib. ii. sec. 13. §. 36. When  
 this publication first appeared, Erasmus (whose previous  
 controverſy with Luther upon the ſubject of Free  
 Will probably tended much to produce an ameliora-  
 tion of the Lutheran ſyſtem) made the following re-  
 flexions; “ Indies miteſcit febris Lutherana, adeo ut  
 “ ipſe Lutherus de ſingulis propemodum ſcribit pali-  
 “ nodias, ac cæteris habeatur ob hoc ipſum hæreticus  
 “ ac delirus.” Anno 1528. Epiſtolæ, lib. xx. ep. 63.  
 And again, lib. xx. epiſt. 67.

That Melancthon not only abandoned, but repre-  
 hended the doctrine in the year 1529, we cannot  
 doubt, becauſe his own expreſs testimony in proof of  
 it remains on record. In a letter to Chriſtopher Stath-  
 mio, not long before his death, he notices the ſubject  
 in theſe words: “ Apud Homerum fortiffimus bellator  
 “ optat concordiam his verbis; ὡς ἔρις ἔκτε δέων, ἔκτε ἀν-  
 “ θρώπων ἀπόλοιτο. Quanto magis me ſenem et infir-  
 “ mum optare pacem conſentaneum eſt? *Ante annos*  
 “ *triginta*, non ſtudio contentionis, ſed propter gloriam  
 “ Dei, et propter diſciplinam, *reprehendi* Stoica para-  
 “ doxa de neceſſitate, *quia et contra Deum contumelioſa*  
 “ *sunt, et nocent moribus.* Nunc mihi bellum inferunt  
 “ Stoicorum phalanges, ſed in qua ſententia poſſint ac-  
 “ quieſcere mentes anxix, rurfus moderate expoſui in  
 “ reſponſione quam Bavaricæ inquisitioni oppoſui. . . .”  
 March 20, 1559. Epiſt. Lib. Lond. p. 407. By con-  
 ſulting the tract, to which he himſelf alludes, we find  
 him uſing this ſtrong and unequivocal language;  
 “ *Palam etiam rejicio et deteſtor Stoicos et Manichæos fu-*  
 “ *rores*, qui affirmant omnia neceſſario fieri bonas et  
 “ malas actiones, de quibus omitto hic longiores diſ-  
 “ putationes. Tantum oro juniores, ut fugiant *bas*  
 “ *mon-*



“*monstruosas opiniones, quæ sunt contumeliosæ contra Deum, et perniciosæ moribus.*” Opera, vol. i. p. 370.

From his Loci Theologici, in which he had at first introduced it, he expunged this obnoxious tenet in the year 1533, inserting in its place the opposite one of Contingency. For it is certain, that then appeared a new and enlarged edition of the work; thus amended, (Buddæi Isagoge, p. 346,) and that still further additions to it were made in the year 1545. Luther indeed never formally revoked any of his writings; but on this last corrected production of his friend he bestowed the highest commendations. Preface to the 1st volume of his Works, anno 1546. He nevertheless scrupled not publicly to assert, that at the beginning of the Reformation he had not completely settled his Creed: “Edidi item meæ fidei confessionem, in qua quid et quomodo credam, et quibus in Articulis *tandem* acquiescere cogitem, palam testatus sum.” Opera Witteb. vol. vii. p. 139. He seems indeed to have generally avoided the subject, from the period of his controversy with Erasmus, to the publication of his Commentary upon Genesis, his last work of importance: but in this, after a long argument to prove that, as we have no knowledge of the unrevealed Deity, we have nothing to do with those things which are above our comprehension; (“de Deo quatenus non est revelatus nulla fit fides, nulla scientia, et cognitio nulla. Atque ibi tenendum, quod dicitur, quæ supra nos, nihil ad nos;”) and that we are not to reason upon Predestination out of Christianity, he thus apologizes for his former opinions; “Hæc studiose et accurate sic monere et tradere volui, quia post meam mortem multi meos libros proferent in medium, et inde omnis generis errores, et deliria sua confirma-

“bunt.

“ bunt. Scripsi autem inter reliqua *esse omnia absoluta*  
 “ *et necessaria*, sed simul addidi, *quod aspiciendus sit*  
 “ *Deus revelatus*, sicut in Psalmo canimus, Jesus Chris-  
 “ tus est Dominus Zebaoth, nec est alius Deus. Et  
 “ alias sæpiissime. Sed istos locos omnes transibunt, et  
 “ eos tantum arripient *de Deo abscondito*. Vos ergo,  
 “ qui nunc me audistis, memineritis me hoc docuisse,  
 “ *Non esse inquirendum de Prædestinatione Dei abscon-*  
 “ *diti, sed in illis acquiescendum, quæ revelantur per vo-*  
 “ *cationem et per ministerium verbi*. . . . Hæc eadem  
 “ autem alibi quoque in meis libris protestatus sum,  
 “ et nunc etiam viva voce trado : *Ideo sum excusatus.*”  
 Opera, vol. vi. p. 355.

This subject will be again alluded to in note 14,  
 Sermon IV. and in note 15, Sermon VII.

---

## NOTES

### ON SERMON III.

*Page 53, note (').*

HOW much this important doctrine was suppressed or sophisticated by the School divines, I have endeavoured to point out in various parts of these Lectures. Many maintained, that Christ died only for original sin, or, as it was then supposed to be, imputed guilt; and of this opinion Aquinas was accused: “Quare reputandus est error Thomæ, qui scripsit corpus Domini semel oblatum in cruce *pro debito originali, jugiter offerri pro quotidianis delictis in altare*; ut habeat in hoc Ecclesia munus ad placandum sibi Deum.” Apolog. Confess. August. apud Cælestinum, p. 73. To a similar tenet of the day Luther likewise alludes in the following passages: “Aliqui docuerunt eum *tantummodo pro originali peccato mortuum esse*, cæterum de actualibus nosmetipsos satisfacere oportere. Aliqui vero affirmarunt lapsus post baptismum jam nihil prodesse Christum.” Opera Witteb. vol. i. p. 141. “Præterea plerique ipsorum jam rursus horribili et Satanica audacia et impudentia incipiunt docere, *Christum tantum satisfecisse pro peccato originali*, et præteritis peccatis, pro actualibus et sequentibus oportere nos satisfacere. Hoc nihil dissimulanter et palam est facere ex Christianis Turcas et Ethnicos.” Opera, vol. vii. p. 239. “Cur jam aperte concionentur,

“tur pro peccatis post baptismum commissis Christum  
 “non satisfecisse, *sed tantum pro culpa originali.*” Con-  
 ciones ad 16 Joan. In Seckendorf. Histor. Lutheran.  
 vol. ii. lib. 3. sect. 17. §. 78.

It was in opposition to this prevalent conceit of the time, highly offensive to the Reformers, that the subsequent expressions were inserted in the Augsbourg Confession, and transcribed from thence into our 2d Article: “Esetque hostia, non tantum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis;” and that others of a similar import were used in another part of it, from which the first clause in our 31st Article was derived. See note 12 of Sermon II. It should be likewise observed, that the same allusion to this obnoxious doctrine frequently occurs both in the Bishops’ Book, and King’s Book, published in the reign of Henry.

*Page 55, note (2).*

“Ipsi audivimus excellentes theologos desiderare  
 “modum in Scholastica doctrina, quæ multo plus ha-  
 “bet rixarum philosophicarum, quam pietatis. Et ta-  
 “men in his veteres fere propriiores sunt Scripturæ,  
 “quam recentiores. Ita magis magisque degeneravit  
 “istorum theologia. Nec alia causa fuit multis bonis  
 “viris, qui initio amare Lutherum cœperunt, quam  
 “quod videbant eum explicare animos hominum ex  
 “illis labyrinthis confusissimarum et infinitarum dispu-  
 “tationum, quæ sunt apud Scholasticos theologos, et  
 “canonistas, et res utiles ad pietatem docere.” Apo-  
 logia Confessionis, p. 63. apud Cœlestinum. The Apo-  
 logy or Defence of the Augsbourg Confession was com-  
 posed by the same author as the Confession itself,  
 and at the same period; and has always obtained an  
 equal authority, being enumerated with it among the  
 symbolical productions of the Lutherans.

Page 56, note (3).

A singular argument upon the corporeal propagation of what the Schoolmen termed Fomes, or Concupiscentia, occurs in the following passage of Scotus : “ Diceretur, quod de infecto generatur infectum. Exemplum. De semine patris leprosi generatur corpus filii leprosum. Ergo leo comedens cadaver hominis mortui contraheret secundum hoc fomitem. Probatio confessionis. Illud enim cadaver infectum est fomite ; et patet de infecto generatur infectum.” The solution of this difficulty is thus given ; “ Virtus illa infecta de infecto semine generat carnem infectam, et tunc non valet instantia de leone, quia virtus ejus activa conversiva in membrum leonis non est infecta.” Scotus, lib. ii. distinct. 32.

“ Extenuant peccatum originis Scholastici doctores, non satis intelligentes definitionem peccati originalis, quam acceperunt a patribus. De fomite disputant, quod sit *qualitas corporis*, et, ut suo more sint inepti, quærun, *utrum qualitas illa contagione pomi, an ex afflatu serpentis contracta sit ; utrum augeatur medicamentis.*” Apolog. Confess. apud Cœlest. de Peccato Originali, p. 2. In the same chapter Melancthon thus alludes to other opinions upon this subject : “ Quidam enim disputant peccatum originis non esse aliquod in natura hominis vitium seu corruptionem, sed tantum servitutem, seu conditionem mortalitatis, quam propagati ex Adam sustineant, sine aliquo proprio vitio propter alienam culpam. Præterea addunt neminem damnari morte æterna propter peccatum originis. Sicut ex ancilla servi nascantur, et hanc conditionem sine naturæ vitiis, sed propter calamitatem matris, sustinent.”

Page 58, note (4).

Scholastici disputant quod justitia originalis non fuerit

rit connaturalis, sed, *ceu ornatus quidam, additus homini tanquam donum*. Ut si quis formosæ puellæ coronam imponat. Corona certe non est pars naturæ virginis; sed *quiddam separatum a natura, quod ab extra accidit, et sine violatione naturæ potest iterum adimi*. Quare disputant de homine et dæmonibus, quod etsi originalem justitiam amiserint, tamen naturalia pura manserint, sicut initio condita sunt. Sed hæc sententia, quia peccatum originis extenuat, ceu venenum, fugienda est. Quin hoc statuamus justitiam non fuisse quoddam donum, quod ab extra accederet, separatum a natura hominis; sed fuisse vere *naturalem*, ita ut natura Adæ esset diligere Deum, credere Deo, agnoscere Deum, &c. Lutheri Opera, vol. vi. p. 38. Et notandum, quod ista *carentia justitiæ*, quæ est in propagato, est peccatum originale. Nicolaus de Orbellis, Compendium Doctoris Subtil. dicta complectens, lib. ii. distinct. 30 and 31.

Page 59, note (5.)

Upon the point of imputation Lombard thus expresses himself; “Quærit forte, utrum originale peccatum ex voluntate fit? Respondeo, prorsus et originale peccatum ex voluntate esse, *quia hoc ex voluntate primi hominis seminatum est*, ut in illo esset, et in omnes transfiret.” Libri Sentent. lib. ii. distinct. 30. The same doctrine was supported by all the Scholastics, in their various Comments upon this passage. “Omnes doctores et sancti catholici tenent et docent tam verbo quam scripto, quod peccatum originale in parvulis non est voluntarium voluntate, vel actu voluntatis personalis ipsius parvuli, *sed solum a voluntate primi hominis*.” Durand. a Sanct. Porcian. in lib. ii. dist. 30. quæst. 2. “Quantum etiam ad secundam partem, scilicet, quod quilibet est debitor hujus justitiæ, probatur, quia justitia originalis data est Adæ, *non in quantum erat singularis persona, sed in quantum erant*

“ in

*“ in eo omnia individua naturæ humanæ virtualiter ; et  
 “ sic accepit justitiam pro se, et pro tota sua posteritate. . . .*

*“ Ad secundum sicut dictum est, peccatum originale*

*“ est carentia justitiæ originalis cum debito habendi*

*“ eam ; cum ergo quæritur, per quam viam peccatum*

*“ intrat, dico, quod debitum oritur ex datione justitiæ*

*“ Adæ pro se et posteris. . . . Ad quartum dico, quod*

*“ filius non portabit iniquitatem patris, loquendo de*

*“ peccato, quo pater peccat, ut singularis persona. A-*

*“ dam autem peccavit, ut principium totius generis hu-*

*“ mani, cum accepisset justitiam pro se et sua posteritate.”*

Nicolaus de Orbellis, lib. ii. distinct. 30 et 31. See

also the same more at large in Aquinas, Summa Theo-

logiæ, Prima Secund. quæst. 81. art. 1.

With respect to the punishment due to imputed guilt, it was supposed to consist merely in a deprivation of the beatific vision. See Scotus, lib. ii. Sentent. distinct. 33.

Original sin therefore, upon this system, was held to be nothing more than such a participation in the guilt of Adam, as to bereave us, not of the natural gifts of the first creation, but only of its superadded graces ; as to incapacitate us from acquiring everlasting happiness, yet not expose us to everlasting misery. But the peculiarity of the doctrine cannot be better explained than in the words of Luther : “ Dis-  
 “ sentiunt tamen a Pelagianis, quod sine Christo non  
 “ posse bene vivi meritorie concedunt : et ita Christus  
 “ non est mortuus propter peccatum, sed propter non me-  
 “ ritum. Non fuisset necesse eum mori, ut inferni  
 “ poenas solveret, sed tantum, ut mereri cælum contin-  
 “ geret. Nam finge parvulumadolescere sine peccato,  
 “ (id enim, etsi difficile, tamen asserunt possibile,) huic non  
 “ est necessarius Christus redemptor de potestate Diaboli,

“*sed adjutor duntaxat ad cælum, quia, si is moreretur,*  
 “*nec ad infernum nec cælum veniret.*

“*Qua theologia mihi videntur asserere neminem*  
 “*nasci filium iræ et filium Diaboli, nisi filium iræ Dia-*  
 “*bolique dixeris id esse, quod non meritorium. Et*  
 “*dum sacerdos exufflat Satanam in parvulis baptizan-*  
 “*dis, ut locum det Spiritui Sancto, intelligitur solum*  
 “*facere ex vase non meritorio meritorium. Sic enim vasa*  
 “*iræ Apostolus cogitur nunc demum intellexisse. Et bap-*  
 “*tismi Sacramentum confert gratiam non in remissionem*  
 “*peccati, sed initium meriti duntaxat, et illud symboli*  
 “*confiteor unum baptismum in remissionem peccato-*  
 “*rum’ nova glossa oportet intelligi, non de peccatis*  
 “*damnationis, sed de peccatis non meritoriis.*

“*Ac si peccatum originale nullum damnum intulit,*  
 “*nisi quod privavit merito, et visione Dei. Et ea priva-*  
 “*tio visionis, id est, omnium bonorum, non est malum,*  
 “*nisi voce tantum, scilicet privatio. Sic enim theolo-*  
 “*gissamus hodie. Et Christus pro nobis factus male-*  
 “*dictum et peccatum, ut de maledicto et peccato nos*  
 “*liberaret, non aliter intelligitur, quam quod est fac-*  
 “*tus non meritorium, ut de non meritorio nos libera-*  
 “*ret. Denique vocabulum illud peccatum per totam*  
 “*Scripturam novam accipiet significationem, id est Scrip-*  
 “*tura induet confusionem.”* Decem Præcep. Witteb.  
 Populo prædicata anno 1516 et 1517. Opera, vol. i.  
 p. 13.

It was solely perhaps with an eye to these opinions, that the Lutherans adopted the following terms in their public definition of Original Sin: “Item docent, quod post lapsum Adæ omnes homines secundum naturam propagati nascuntur cum peccato, hoc est, sine metu Dei, sine fiducia erga Deum, et cum concupiscentia; quodque hic morbus seu vitium originis,

“*verz*



“*vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem* his, qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum.” Augsbourg Confess. art. 2. orig. edition. Here they appear simply to have maintained the converse of the Scholastical proposition, which stated, that Original Sin consists not in any mental depravity, nor exposes to the danger of eternal death.

In this extract from the Augsbourg Confession no allusion whatsoever is made to imputed guilt. It should be added however, that some years after the Diet of Augsbourg, Melancthon became less scrupulous upon that point. “*Si quis imaginatur,*” he observes in his *Loci Theologici*, “*peccatum originis tantum esse reatum propter lapsum Adæ sine pravitæ in nobis, errat. Si quis autem contendit, nascentes esse reos et propter Adæ lapsum et propter pravitatem nobiscum nascentem,* non impedio, quo minus addat eam particulam definitioni, quod peccatum sit tum reatus propter Adæ lapsum, tum defectus, vel inclinatio, vel actio pugnans cum lege Dei, &c. *Sed nolo tenuissime omnia limare.*” p. 106. Hence, with other augmentations, it was subsequently introduced into the Confession itself, in an edition of the year 1540.

*Page 59, note (6).*

“*Ad tertium dico, quod ad istud peccatum concurrunt duo carentia justitiæ, scilicet ut formale, et debitum habendi, ut materiale: sicut in aliis privationibus concurrit privatio et aptitudo ad habitum. Debitum istud a Deo statuente legem istam. Do justitiam tibi, Adæ, et omnibus filiis tuis naturalibus; do eadem datione, quantum est ex parte mea, et ideo ex hac datione tenentur omnes eam habere, et ex parte pro-*pagante, per cujus actionem iste est filius naturalis

“Adæ.” Scotus in Lib. Sentent. lib. ii. dist. 32. Thus it seems, that Scotus discarded concupiscence wholly from his definition of Original Sin. But this is more evident from the following passage; “Peccatum originale non potest esse aliud, *quam ista privatio*; non enim est concupiscentia: tum quia illa est naturalis, tum quia ipsa est in parte sensitiva, *ubi non est peccatum.*” Lib. ii. distinct. 30.

That concupiscence was not sin, the Papists of every sect constantly maintained: “Qui,” (viz. Scholastici,) “cum in baptismo remitti omnia peccata scirent, statim intulerunt, nullum ibi relinqui peccatum, *fomitum non peccatum sed infirmitatem, contra expressum textum Apostoli, appellant.*” Opera Lutheri, vol. i. p. 303.

Indeed, the Lutherans were persuaded, that upon this point their adversaries were little better than Pelagians, who denied Original Sin altogether: “*Pelagius omnino sustulit peccatum originis, et finxit homines posse legi Dei perfecte satisfacere, et externa obedientia seu disciplina mediocri coram Deo justos esse. Ac propemodum idem docent Occam et multi alii.*” Melanct. Opera, vol. i. p. 414. “Pelagiani universam doctrinam de peccato originis negant, nomine etiam sublato. Recentiores, *ut Occam et multi alii*, non men retinent peccati originalis, sed rem extenuant.” Loci Theologici, p. 113. ed. 1595. William of Occam, here alluded to, (an English Scholastic of high reputation,) had been a peculiar favourite both with Luther and Melancthon; the former styling him, “Carus magister meus,” (Admon. ad Eccles. apud Cœlestin. p. 261.) and the latter, “Deliciæ quondam nostræ.” (Orat. pro M. Luthero. Opera vol. ii. p. 58.)

Page 61, note (?).

“Adversarii docent, naturalem illam impotentiam, et inclinationes legi Dei contrarias, *peccata non esse, atque hac ratione doctrinæ legis, pœnitentiæ, peccato, et gratiæ, magnam inducunt caliginem.*” Melancthon’s Synopsis Brevis, &c. in Cœlestinus’s History of the Augsburgh Confession, p. 100. “Jactatur et hoc dictum,” observes the same Reformer in a more public production, “*Naturam bonam esse. Id verum est quatenus reliquum est opus Dei. Sed natura hominis horribiliter læsa et contaminata est, sicut pingit imago vulnerati, Lucæ i. 10. Spoliati fumus donis naturæ integræ, id est, firma Dei notitia, sapientia, justitia, et insuper hæc reliqua natura vulnerata est, scilicet, prava concupiscentia, morte, et variis malis animæ et corporis.*” Loci Theologici, p. 118.

And again; “Sed adversarii multas falsas hypotheses ponunt. Primum *de caligine mentis, et de vitiis in voluntate, nihil dicunt.* Deinde *concupiscentiam* tantum intelligunt *de sensibus*, et intelligunt eam esse appetitionem naturalem, cum deberent eam intelligere ἀταξίαν appetitionum, et simul complecti caliginem mentis et malæ voluntatis.” Id. p. 122.

The similarity likewise of Luther’s sentiments upon the same subject, (which cannot be misconceived when contrasted with their proper object,) the following extract from his Commentary on Hosea may tend to prove: “*Natura enim ad vitam condita morti et infirmitis calamitatibus subiecta est. Mens, in qua Dei notitia lucebat, per peccatum ita excœcata est, ut Deum amplius non agnoscat. Voluntas quoque ad eum modum est depravata, ut diversum concupiscat a lege Dei. Itaque mirabilis ἀταξία omnium affectuum seu motuum est, qui etsi omnes per se vitiosi non sint, (nam appetitus cibi et potus, amor conjugis,*

“liberorum, et parentum, et similes affectus, etiam in  
 “*integra natura extitissent,*) tamen nunc non *ita* puri  
 “sunt. Semper enim adhæret *vitiosum aliquid*, legi  
 “Dei adversum.” Opera, vol. iv. p. 277. What he  
 means in this quotation by that blindness of intellect,  
 which no longer acknowledges a Deity, may be col-  
 lected from another passage in the same volume, in  
 which his idea is more accurately defined: “Eatenus  
 “igitur,” he there remarks, “procedit lumen naturæ  
 “et ratio, quod Deum fatetur esse, deinde bonum,  
 “clementem, misericordem, erga omnes beneficium esse  
 “sentit. Hoc sane *magnum* lumen est, tamen hæc ad-  
 “huc non est vera cognitio Dei; duo enim desunt.

“Nam rationalis aut psychicus homo sentio quidem  
 “Deum esse tam potentem et sapientem, quod in om-  
 “nibus periculis juvare et omnia bona donare possit.  
 “Quod autem *paterne erga nos sit affectus, et propensif-*  
 “*sima ac optima voluntate erga me*, qui nunc affligor,  
 “hoc non potest assequi natura; ibi *nihil certi* statuere  
 “potest humana ratio. . . .

“Secundo discamus rationem quidem cognoscere,  
 “quod sit aliqua divinitas, at tum demum falli, cum  
 “incipit statuere quis aut ubi sit verus Deus. *Per le-*  
 “*gem naturæ igitur mentibus insculptam sentit ratio De-*  
 “*um esse. Quis autem sit verus ille Deus, hoc ignorat.*”  
 Enarr. in Jon. Ib. p. 412.

Page 63, note (8).

The passage of Luther alluded to is in his Com-  
 mentary upon Genesis, c. 17. He there delivers his  
 sentiments upon the salvation of infants unbaptized, in  
 the following unequivocal language; “De extinctis  
 “infantibus ante octavum diem facilis responsio est,  
 “sicut etiam de nostris infantibus, qui ante baptismum  
 “extinguantur; non enim peccant in fœdus circumci-  
 “sionis aut baptismi. Quia enim lex mandat octavo  
 “die

“die circumcidi, quomodo damnaret Deus ante octavum  
 “diem extinctos? . . . .

“Etsi enim infantes afferunt peccatum innatum,  
 “quod originale vocamus, tamen *magnum est, quod*  
 “*contra legem nihil peccarunt.* Cum igitur Deus na-  
 “tura misericors sit, non ideo *deteriori conditione esse*  
 “finet, quod vel circumcisionem in veteri Testamento,  
 “vel baptismum in novo, consequi *non potueret.*” Ope-  
 ra, vol. vii. p. 196.

“Et nota regula est, favores ampliandos, rigores au-  
 “tem restringendos. Id in hac causa facimus cum  
 “Dei gloria. *Est enim ejus natura ignoscere et misereri.*  
 “Non igitur statuimus eum duriores esse in sui populi in-  
 “fantes, quos mors prævenit, quo minus pactum hoc pos-  
 “sint consequi. Vult enim omnes homines salvos fieri.  
 “Hæc sententia opponenda est doctoribus istis; et pro-  
 “missiones largissime dilatandæ, ira autem et rigor re-  
 “stringendus.” Ibid. p. 204.

The sentiments of Luther upon this topic were more formally and fully explained by his friend and fellow-labourer in reform, Bugenhagen, who with this view published an explication of the twenty-ninth Psalm, with the approbation of Luther subjoined to it. In that work Bugenhagen argued, that all children, who are brought to Christ, are certain of salvation; and that all are thus brought, who are offered to him in prayer, even without baptism: “Ad Christum  
 “porro et infantuli veniunt, qui ad ipsum adducuntur,  
 “ut de iisdem puerulis affirmat, qui ei apportantur;  
 “*Sinite parvulos ad me venire, et nolite vetare eos, nam*  
 “*talium* (non infantium apud Judæos, apud Turcas,  
 “sed eorum, qui mihi offeruntur) *regnum cælorum est.*  
 “Offeruntur autem etiam Christo, et veniunt ad Chris-  
 “tum, per preces nostras, infantes illi, quos baptizare  
 “nondum possumus, libentissime tamen baptizare volumus,

“ ubi baptizandi nobis facultas evenerit ; *et Christus eos*  
 “ *recepit secundum suam promissionem, quicquid petieritis*  
 “ *dabitur vobis, &c.*” p. 59. ed. 1632.

And in another part of the same treatise he spoke thus decidedly respecting the fate of those infants, who perished under the persecution of Pharaoh and of Herod, without having received the seal of the ancient Covenant : “ Infantuli isti, quos Pharaoh submergi curat *ante octavum diem, incircumcisi, perinde sancti*  
 “ *sunt martyres, ac reliqui post circumcisionem suffocati. Quod ipsum quoque fateri cogimur de pueris*  
 “ *ab Herode propter Christum interemptis. Fac*  
 “ *missos fanaticos. Singulari Deus amore et prosequitur*  
 “ *pueros, et offerri sibi eos vult, et toto pectore libentissime*  
 “ *suscipit ; quod promissionibus quidem et factis satis de-*  
 “ *clarat.*” p. 47.

When the Lutherans on such occasions excluded Heathen children from the participation of Christian security, it should be remarked, that they excluded them only from a participation of God's covenanted mercies, and from that certainty of salvation, which is thence derivable : “ Ratae firmæque promissiones Christi,” said the same author, “ de parvulis sunt quos ei  
 “ adducimus ; certo illos ad Christum pervenire, in  
 “ Christo suscipi, et salvos esse.” Ibid. p. 63. And again ; “ Alii (viz. alii Anabaptistæ) qui peccatum originis fatentur esse, sententiam de istis infantibus aiunt  
 “ *arcano Dei judicio committi oportere. Ita diabolus*  
 “ *hoc unice contendit ; ut ex animo deileamus Dei*  
 “ *promissiones, quibus nititur fiducia nostra, atque in*  
 “ *tenebris contra palpemus, satagendo de arcanis Dei*  
 “ *judiciis. Nos vero infantes esse in peccatis conceptos et natos affirmamus, neque salvos fieri posse sine*  
 “ *Christo, cui illos in baptismo adducimus. Sententiam hic habemus plenam gratiæ et securitatis atque*  
 “ *certi-*

“ *certitudinis*, ‘Sinite parvulos ad me venire,’ quam eripi nobis nunquam patiemur. *Ea non occultum quoddam Dei judicium, non cœca quædam opinio est, sed grata Dei promissio*; qua in cœleste regnum liberi nostri transcribuntur, quum Christo sistuntur, quia sine Christo nulla salus. Atque *idcirco* Turcarum et Judæorum liberi salutis participes non fiunt, quia Christo non sistuntur.” Ibid. p. 32. But Luther in his Commentary on Hosea touched the point even more directly, referring the development of God’s unrevealed mercies to a future state. After reasoning in a mode similar to the preceding, he added; “ *De Ethnicorum pueris aliud judicium est, qui sunt extra Ecclesiam; quanquam fortasse de his quoque mitius aliquid statuetur, quam de adultis. Sed hæc futura vita aperiet. Cavendum autem studiose est, ne quid pronunciamus, quod verbo non est revelatum, sicut certa verbi revelatio est de baptizatis, ut ante Christi adventum de circumcisis, quod sunt recepti a Deo in gratiam.*” Opera, vol. iv. p. 315. That he likewise deemed the same caution necessary in the case of adults as well as infants, will be pointed out in Sermon V. note 1.

Page 63, note (°).

“ Ideo sic respondemus; in baptismo tolli peccatum, quod ad reatum seu imputationem attinet, sed *ma- nere morbum ipsum*, qui est malum pugnans cum lege Dei *dignum* morte æterna, *nisi remitteretur*, ut dicitur, ‘beati quorum tecta sunt peccata.’ Nec de nomine peccati litigamus, rerum dissensio est. Adversarii contendunt hunc morbum, qui reliquus est in renatis, *non esse malum, pugnans cum lege Dei. Hunc errorem taxari necesse est.*” Loci Theologici, p. 122. Here, as in other passages of a similar description, it should be observed, that an evident distinction is made between the guilt of original depravity, and the depravity

depravity itself; the former is said to be remitted, the latter to remain, although becoming daily more and more diminished by the operation of God's Holy Spirit: "*Mirus est intellectus baptismi,*" remarked Melancthon in a public disputation with the Papists, "*si sanctificari infantes sine Sancto Spiritu existimant.*" "*Nam cum remittitur hoc peccatum, simul datur Spiritus Sanctus, qui repugnare huic peccato tunc incipit, et postea in adultis repugnat.*" "*Nam cum in baptismo datur Spiritus Sanctus, is in adultis, qui non excidunt, certe est efficax.*" Opera, vol. iv. p. 654.

The same point also is thus adverted to in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession: "*Hic flagellant adversarii etiam Lutherum, quod scripserit peccatum originis manere post baptismum.*" "*Addunt hunc Articulum jure damnatum esse a Leone X. Sed Cæsar. majest. in hoc loco manifestam calumniam deprehendet.*" "*Sciunt enim adversarii in quam sententiam Lutherus hoc dictum velit, quod peccatum originis reliquum sit post baptismum.*" "*Semper ita scripsit quod baptismus tollat reatum peccati originalis, etiam amfi materiale, ut isti vocant, peccati maneat, videlicet concupiscentia.*" "*Addidit etiam de materiali, quod Spiritus Sanctus per baptismum incipit mortificare concupiscentiam, et novos motus creat in homine.*" p. 3. apud Cœlest.

*Page 64, note (10).*

"*In Scholis transtulerunt huc ex philosophia prorsus alienas sententias: quod propter passiones nec boni nec mali simus, nec laudamur nec vituperamur. Item, nihil esse peccatum nisi voluntarium. Hæ sententiæ apud philosophos de civili judicio dictæ sunt, non de judicio Dei.*" "*Nihilo prudentius assuunt et alias sententias naturam non esse malam.*" "*Id in loco dictum non reprehendimus.*" "*Sed non recte detorque-*"



“quetur ad extenuandum peccatum originis. Et ta-  
 “men hæ sententiæ leguntur apud Scholasticos, qui  
 “intempestive commiscent philosophicam seu civilem  
 “doctrinam de moribus cum Evangelio. Neque hæc  
 “in Scholis tantum disputantur, sed ex Scholis, ut fit,  
 “efferebantur ad populum. Et hæ persuasiones regna-  
 “bant, et alebant fiduciam humanarum virium, et op-  
 “primebant cognitionem gratiæ Christi. Itaque Luthe-  
 “rus volens magnitudinem peccati originalis et huma-  
 “næ infirmitatis declarare, docuit, reliquias illas pec-  
 “cati originalis non esse sua natura in homine ἀδιάφορα,  
 “sed indigere gratia Christi, ne imputentur, item Spiritu  
 “Sancto, ut mortificentur.” Apolog. Confess. p. 3.

When the Lutherans laboured so repeatedly and earnestly to prove, against their opponents, the corruption introduced by the transgression of Adam, it was far from their intention to represent fallen man as dead to every sense of moral obligation, and of that eternal duty, which is due from the creature to the Creator. For the law of nature, written by the finger of God, not in perishable characters upon tables of stone, but indelibly upon the human heart, in their idea still remained, less brilliant indeed, but not wholly effaced. “Est ergo vera definitio legis naturæ, legem naturæ esse notitiam legis divinæ, naturæ hominis insitam. Ideo enim dicitur homo ad imaginem Dei conditus esse, quia in eo lucebat imago, hoc est, notitia Dei et similitudo quædam mentis divinæ; id est, discrimen honestorum et turpium, et cum his notitiis congruebant vires hominis. Voluntas erat conversa ad Deum ante lapsum, ardebant et in mente veræ notitiæ, et in voluntate amor erga Deum, et assentiebantur corda, sine ulla dubitatione, veris notitiis. Ac statuebant nos conditos esse ad agnoscendum et celebrandum Deum, et ad obediendum huic  
 “Domi-

“Domino, qui nos condidit, alit, impressit imaginem  
 “fui, qui iusta postulat et approbat, e contra vero  
 “damnat et punit injusta. Quanquam autem in hac  
 “naturæ corruptione, *deformata imagine Dei*, non ita  
 “fulgent notitiæ, *manent tamen*, sed cor repugnat, et  
 “incurrunt dubitationes propter quædam, quæ pug-  
 “nare videntur cum illis notitiis.” Loci Theologici,  
 p. 173.

But it may be said, why then, if such were their  
 sentiments, did they argue, that we are incapable by  
 our innate strength of converting with a true faith and  
 fear to God? No better answer can be given, than in  
 the words of their own Apology: “Cum de peccato  
 “originis loquuntur, (viz. Scholastici,) graviora vitia  
 “humanæ naturæ non commemorant, scilicet igno-  
 “rationem Dei, contemptum Dei, vacare metu et  
 “fiducia Dei, odisse iudicium Dei, fugere Deum judi-  
 “cantem, irasci Deo, desperare gratiam, habere fidu-  
 “ciam rerum præsentium, &c. Hos morbos, qui ma-  
 “xime adversantur legi Dei, non animadvertunt Scho-  
 “lastici. Imo tribuunt interim humanæ naturæ inte-  
 “gras vires ad diligendum Deum super omnia, ad fa-  
 “cienda præcepta Dei, quoad substantiam actuum.  
 “Nec vident se pugnantiâ dicere. Nam propriis viri-  
 “bus posse diligere Deum super omnia, facere præ-  
 “cepta Dei, *quid aliud est quam habere iustitiam ori-*  
 “*ginis?* Quod si has tantas vires habet humana na-  
 “tura, ut *per sese* possit diligere Deum super omnia, ut  
 “confidenter affirmant Scholastici, *quid est peccatum*  
 “*originis?* Quorsum autem opus erit *gratia Christi*, si  
 “nos possumus fieri iusti *propria iustitia?* Quorsum  
 “opus erit Spiritu Sancto, si vires humanæ *per sese*  
 “possunt Deum super omnia diligere, et præcepta Dei  
 “facere? Leviores morbos in natura hominis agnos-  
 “cunt, graviores morbos non agnoscunt, de quibus ta-  
 “men

“men ubique admonet nos Scriptura, et Prophetæ  
 “perpetuo conqueruntur, videlicet de carnali securi-  
 “tate, de contemptu Dei, de odio Dei, et similibus vi-  
 “tiis nobiscum natis. *Sed postquam admiscuerunt Scho-*  
 “*lastici doctrinæ Christianæ philosophiam de perfectione*  
 “*naturæ, et plusquam satis erat libero arbitrio et actibus*  
 “*elicitis tribuerunt, et homines philosophica seu civili*  
 “*justitia* (quam et nos fatemur rationi subjectam esse,  
 “et aliquo modo in potestate nostra esse) *justificari co-*  
 “*ram Deo docuerunt, non potuerunt videre interiorem*  
 “*immunditiam* naturæ hominum. Neque enim potest  
 “judicari, nisi ex verbo Dei, quod Scholastici in suis  
 “disputationibus non sæpe tractant.

“*Illæ fuerunt causæ, cur in descriptione peccati origi-*  
 “*nis et concupiscentiæ mentionem fecimus, et detraximus*  
 “*naturalibus viribus hominis timorem et fiduciam erga*  
 “*Deum.*” p. 2. apud Cœlest.

Page 64, note (11).

A sect of the Anabaptists held, with the ancient Pelagians, that Original Sin consists not in any inherent depravity, but solely in the imitation of Adam. In the minds however of the Lutherans the Scholastical palliation of this doctrine was little better than the Anabaptistical abnegation of it. Hence, principally against the Papists, is the attack made in every part of the definition adopted by our Reformers. In the Article indeed of 1552, after the words, “ut fabulantur Pelagiani,” occurred the following, “et hodie Anabaptistæ repetunt:” but these seem to have been introduced merely for the purpose of less openly declaring the object of assault; and were consequently omitted in 1562, when disguise was less necessary, or less regarded. That the Restorers of our Church under Elizabeth were not so scrupulous in their censures of Romish error, as the Founders of it in the preceding reign,

reign, plainly appears from their insertion of a strong and highly offensive epithet in our 31st Article. For there the sacrifices of the Mass, which were denominated by their predecessors simply "figmenta," they characterized as "*blasphema figmenta*," not hesitating to call that, which was universally esteemed the most sacred, and which certainly was the most lucrative, doctrine of Popery, *blasphemous*.

Besides the obvious proof of the intention in this respect, which the terms of the definition throughout themselves furnish, the expressions at the commencement of it, "*ex Adamo naturaliter propagati*," demonstrate, that the opinions of the Papists, rather than of the Anabaptists, were kept in view; for these expressions were directly and solely levelled against what was usually phrased, *the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary*, admitting only such a conception in him, who was not naturally but supernaturally generated. "*Declarat tamen hæc ipsa sancta Synodus*," said the Council of Trent, in a decree upon Original Sin, anno 1546, "*non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam.*"

Page 66, note (<sup>12</sup>).

Notwithstanding the nominal concessions of the Church of Rome upon this point, we find the Council of Trent thus dealing out its indiscriminate anathemas. "*Si quis per Jesu Christi Domini nostri gratiam, quæ in baptismo confertur, reatum originalis peccati remitti negat, aut etiam asserit non tolli totum id, quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet, sed illud dicit tantum radi aut non imputari, anathema sit. . . . Manere autem in baptizatis concupiscentiam vel somniam hæc sancta Synodus fatetur et sentit. . . . Hanc concupiscentiam, quam aliquando Apostolus peccatum*  
" *appel-*

“*appellat*, sancta Synodus declarat Ecclesiam Catholicam nunquam intellexisse peccatum appellari, quod vere et proprie in renatis peccatum sit, sed quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinat. Si quis autem contrarium senserit, anathema sit.” Sessio quinta, 1546. In the Article under review, the expressions, “*Manet tamen in renatis hæc naturæ depravatio*,” and likewise, “*Peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam fatetur Apostolus*,” seem manifestly opposed to the preceding passages, in which, as the Protestants at the time observed, the Council had not only directly contradicted, but absolutely anathematized the Apostle himself. Why our Reformers substituted the word “*depravatio*,” for that of “*concupiscentia*,” or “*fomes*,” previously used by the Council, will appear, if we turn to the Saxon Confession, (written in 1551.) art. de Peccato Originis, where the subsequent remark occurs: “*Vitandæ sunt in Ecclesia ambiguitates. Ideo expresse nominamus hæc mala depravationem, quæ sæpe ab antiquis scriptoribus nominatur mala concupiscentia. Discernimus autem appetitiones in natura conditas a confusione ordinis, quæ post lapsum accessit, sicut Jerem. xvii. dicitur, Prævarium est cor hominis; et Paulus inquit, Sensus carnis inimicitia est adversus Deum. Hanc malam concupiscentiam dicimus esse peccatum.*” I have already observed, that the *fomes* of the Schools was always defined to be a quality void of sin.

When likewise they stated concupiscence to have in itself the nature of sin, “*peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam*,” by leaving out the strong epithets, “*veram et propriam*,” alluded to by the Council of Trent, as generally adopted by the Lutherans, is it not evident, that they intended, on this occasion, by no means to go to the full extent of the

Lutheran

Lutheran definition, and yet to distinguish their own position from that of the Papists? Certain it is, that the propriety or impropriety of introducing those terms must have been in their contemplation, and that they did not accidentally overlook, but designedly omitted them. Wherefore, when the Assembly of Divines, (see note I. Sermon I.) not for Lutheran but Calvinistical purposes, amended this Article, by changing the words, "hath of itself *the nature of sin*," into "*is truly and properly sin*," they indisputably attempted that, which had been previously considered and rejected by our Reformers.

In addition to these remarks, it may be proper also briefly to illustrate what I have advanced as the doctrine of our Article upon the *responsibility* of Original Sin, by comparing it with what had been before established by the Lutherans. The Augsbourg Confession upon the point is thus expressed: "Hic morbus  
" seu vitium originis vere fit peccatum, *damnans et as-*  
" *ferens nunc quoque æternam mortem his*, qui non re-  
" nascuntur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum:" the Loci Theologici of Melancthon thus: "Propter  
" quam corruptionem nati sunt rei et filii iræ, *id est*,  
" *damnati a Deo, nisi fuerit facta remissio*:" and the Saxon Confession, almost in the same terms: "*Nascen-*  
" *tes reos iræ Dei, et dignos æterna damnatione, nisi fiat*  
" *remissio propter Mediatorem*." With these definitions in their eye, certainly with the two former, and most probably with the latter, our own Reformers chose a different and more moderate turn of expression, simply observing, that in every person born into this world Original Sin *deserves* God's wrath and damnation: "in  
" unoquoque nascentium iram Dei atque damnationem  
" *meretur*." Here nothing more is stated, than the offensiveness of the quality itself to a just and holy God,

God, which is said to be deserving of divine condemnation in every man born into this world, but not, as seems to be the sense of the Lutheran form, to expose him to it personally.

But, besides the manifest deviations alluded to, we perceive likewise the omission of the adjective “æterna,” connected in one Confession with the substantive “mors,” in the other with “damnatio;” an omission, we may be assured, neither lightly nor inadvertently made. The meaning of *damnatio* in the Latin language, when unassociated with *æterna*, it is unnecessary to point out; and that the correspondent expression, *damnation*, in the English, under a similar circumstance, admitted a similar construction, at the period of the Reformation, will appear from the following use of it by Bishop Hooper, in his Sermons upon Jonah: “Of these words should those, that be *damned* “by the magistrates, acknowledge, that it is not the “magistrate that putteth them to execution, but God, “whose ministers they be.” Sermon 4.

Page 67, note (<sup>13</sup>).

“Hæc itaque duo distincte observanda, nempe quod “sic omnibus naturæ nostræ partibus vitiatæ, perversique, “jam ob talem *duntaxat* corruptionem damnati merito “convictique coram Deo tenemur. . . . Atque ideo infantes quoque ipsi, dum suam secum damnationem asserunt, *non alieno, sed suo ipsorum vitio* sunt obstricti.” Institut. lib. ii. cap. 1. sect. 8. The same words are repeated lib. iv. cap. 15. sect. 10. These passages, with others which might be quoted of a similar description, seem to prove, that Calvin expressly denied the doctrine of Imputation. Notwithstanding, however, their evident tendency, Turretin attempts to shew, from other parts of his writings, that he even approved of it, although cautious and wary in bringing it forward.

The words of Turretin are these : “ Quia tamen sub-  
 “ inde *viri docti*, cum quibus hic agimus, gravissimorum  
 “ theologorum, et *Calvini imprimis*, Martyris et Cha-  
 “ mieri auctoritatem ostendere solent, *quasi illi hanc*  
 “ *imputationem silentio suo tacite vel etiam aperte et diser-*  
 “ *tis verbis improbaverint* ; non abs re futurum est, si  
 “ paucis, quam a vero aberrant, probatum dederimus.  
 “ Hanc fuisse Calvini sententiam multa probant. Li-  
 “ cet enim non ubique imputationis mentionem faciat,  
 “ quando de peccato originali loquitur, sive quia non-  
 “ dum illa in controversiam vocabatur, sive quia ad-  
 “ versus Albertum Pighium et Ambrosium Cathari-  
 “ num disputabat, qui totam peccati originalis natu-  
 “ ram sola imputatione primi peccati definiebant, nul-  
 “ lam inhærentem corruptionem agnoscentes, ubi pro-  
 “ inde non illi laborandum fuit in probanda imputa-  
 “ tione, quam solam agnoscebant adversarii, sed tan-  
 “ tum in asserenda labe inhærente ; facile tamen est  
 “ ostendere *non ignotam* fuisse, sed *probatam* summo  
 “ viro istam doctrinam.” *Instit. Theolog. loc. ix, quæst.*  
 9. §. 40, 41. Vol. i. p. 691. It should be observed,  
 that Turretin was a Calvinist ; and that, anxious to re-  
 present the founder of his favourite system as ac-  
 quainted with every perfection, which he himself sup-  
 posed to belong to it, he laboured to prove Calvin the  
 supporter of a tenet, of which, by his own confession,  
 learned men had been accustomed to consider that  
 Reformer as an opponent. On all sides however  
 it is granted, that whatsoever Calvin’s sentiments  
 might have been, he did not directly inculcate the  
 doctrine ; while it more surely must be admitted by  
 those, who examine his writings with an impartial  
 eye.

*Page 68, note (14).*

Commissioners were appointed, both in the reign of  
 Henry



Henry and Edward, to draw up a reformed code of ecclesiastical laws, of whom Cranmer was the first in rank, and not the least in the labour of composition. This production, although never sanctioned by authority, was published in the year 1571 by Archbishop Parker. Besides the brief system of ecclesiastical laws comprehended in it, it contains a reference to the doctrine of our Church, almost in the language of her Articles, sometimes abridging, and sometimes paraphrasing them. In the chapter *De Baptismo*, the passage referred to occurs: "*Illorum etiam videri debet scrupulosa superstitio, qui Dei gratiam et Spiritum Sanctum tantopere cum Sacramentorum elementis colligant, ut plane affirmant, nullum Christianorum infantem salutem esse consecuturum, qui prius morte fuerit occupatus, quam ad baptismum adduci potuerit; quod longe secus habere judicamus.*"

Page 68, note (15).

The prayer here noticed is the first in our Baptismal Service. It is not to be found in the ancient offices of the Church of Rome, but seems to have been originally composed by Luther, in whose form of Baptism it was first introduced, (*Opera Germanice Witteb.* vol. vi. p. 105.) and afterwards transferred into the reformed Service of the archbishopric of Cologne, in the year 1543. The words in the German are, "*in der heiligen Arca der Christenheit, trosten und sicher behalten:*" in the Latin of the Cologne form, "*in sancta Ecclesiæ tuæ Arca tutus servari possit:*" and in our own Common Prayer, "*received into the Ark of Christ's Church, and so saved from perishing.*" That Luther meant not, by these equivocal expressions, (if we give them no harsher appellation,) to exclude unbaptized infants from salvation, at least, if he so meant when the prayer was written; that he afterwards

changed his opinion upon the point, is manifest from what has been already stated upon this subject ; surely then he would have acted with more wisdom and liberality, had he adopted the line of conduct pursued by the English Reformers, and discarded them altogether.

*Page 69, note (16).*

Any further detail of Luther's sentiments upon this question seems unnecessary. Calvin, whose zeal for the Reformation led him on all occasions to promote unity and concord, but whose vanity induced him on many points to frame a peculiar system of his own, frequently adopted the phraseology, and often, to a certain extent, the very sentiments, of the Lutherans, as well as Zuinglians. Hence indiscriminating readers perpetually confuse together opinions really different, not perceiving that the coincidence is sometimes only apparent, and seldom complete. This is particularly the case upon the topic of Predestination. Nor is it less so upon that which is at present under consideration. The Lutherans contended, that the Holy Spirit "was efficacious in baptism." To this Calvin assented, but doubtless with certain private reservations too obvious to point out. "Convenit," he observes to Melancthon, "non inanes esse figuras, (viz. Sacramenta,) sed re ipsa præstari, quidquid figurant. In baptismo adesse Spiritus efficaciam, ut nos abluat et regeneret." Epist. Calvin. p. 134. The efficacy however of the Holy Spirit, which they believed to be *always* exerted in *infant* baptism, the Lutherans confined not to that sacred rite, except only as to the appointed means of conferring it, but extended to the children of Christians in general, whom they considered not only as within the divine Covenant, but, being recommended to God in prayer, as certainly entitled to its blessings. A similar language was used by Calvin, which

which it is impossible not to recognize, in the 15th and 16th chapters of the 4th book of his Institute. We cannot however conceive him to have thus expressed himself, consistently with his other opinions, without some tacit qualification. Yet in the following passage he seems to speak generally: "*Sed hanc controverfiam mox nullo negotio dirimet hoc principium, non arceri a regno cælorum infantes, quos e præfenti vita migrare continget, antequam aqua mergi datum fuerit. Atqui jam vifum eft, fieri non levem injuriam Dei fœderi, nifi in eo acquiefcimus; ac fi per fe infirmum effet; quum ejus effectus neque a baptifmo, neque ab ullis acceffionibus pendeat. Accedit poftea Sacramentum figelli inftar, non, quod efficiam Dei promiffioni, quafi per fe invalidæ, conferrat, fed eam duntaxat nobis confirmet. Unde fequitur non ideo baptizari fidelium liberos, ut filii Dei tunc primum fiant, qui ante alieni fuerint ab Ecclefia, fed folenni potius figno ideo recipi in Ecclefiam, quia promiffionis beneficio jam ante ad Chrifti corpus pertinebant. Proinde fi in omittendo figno nec fœcordia eft, nec contemptus, nec negligentia, tuti ab omni periculo fumus.*" Inftit. lib. iv. cap. 15. §. 22. Here he fomething more than hefitates at the declaration of his full meaning; he appears ftudiously to conceal it. In other parts, however, of thefe chapters, he incidentally hints the diftinction, which he constantly bore in mind, but which he was ſcrupulous of directly urging. In the following paffages he collaterally introduces it: "At quomodo, inquiunt, regenerantur infantes, nec boni nec mali cognitione præditi? Nos autem respondemus, opus Dei, fi captui noftro non fubjaceat, non tamen efle nullum. Porro *infantes qui fervandi funt*, (ut certe ex ea ætate omnino *aliqui* fervantur) ante a

“Domino regenerari minime obscurum est.” Cap. xvi. sect. 17. “Et sane ideo a prima infantia sanctificatus fuit Christus, ut ex ætate *qualibet* sine discrimine *electos suos* in seipso sanctificaret.” Ibid. sect. 18. “*Quos electione sua dignatus est Dominus*, sic accepto regenerationis signo, si præsentī vita ante demigrent, quam adoleverint, *eos* virtute sui Spiritus nobis incomprehensa renovat, quo modo expedire solus ipse providet. . . . Quare *nihil plus* in pædobaptismo *præsentis* *efficaciæ* requirendum est, quam ut *fœdus* cum illis Domino percussum *obfirmet*. *Reliqua ejus Sacramenti sanctificatio*, quo tempore Deus ipse providerit, postea consequetur.” Ibid. sect. 21.

Hence appears the important difference between the sentiments of Luther on this point, and those of Calvin. The former contended for the certain salvation of all infants, born of Christian parents; the latter of those only, who are discriminated by an inscrutable decree of divine election; a discrimination, which seems to have been painfully contemplated, and reluctantly avowed.

Page 69, note (17).

The liberality of the sentiments entertained by the Reformers in general, respecting the salvation of infants dying before baptism, originated not with the Lutherans. Zuingli was the first who asserted it; and it should be added, that his assertion was made without restrictions of any kind: “Ista in hunc usum argumentati sumus, ut ostenderemus *toto errare cœlo*, etiam si sint non modo magna, sed vetera quoque nomina, qui *damnationi æternæ solent adjudicare Christianorum infantes*, cum non sint baptismo tincti. . . . Hoc enim ‘qui non crediderit, condemnabitur,’ nulloatenus est *absolute* intelligendum, sed de his, qui, auditō Evangelio, credere noluerunt. Unde *infantes*, et  
“ *qui*

“ *qui non audierunt Evangelium, hac lege non tenentur.*”  
 De Peccato Originali Declaratio Zuinglii. Opera, vol.  
 ii. p. 118. It is impossible to mistake his object even  
 here; but in the following quotations he explains  
 himself more fully: “ Atque hic non immerito quæ-  
 “ ritur, An vero *Christus genus universum restituerit*, an  
 “ *fidelium Ecclesiam tantum?* Quamvis ergo ad hanc  
 “ quætionem paucis respondere potuissemus, *Christum*  
 “ *prorsus sanando tantum profuisse, quantum nocuit Adam*  
 “ *peccando*; porro Adam *infecit universam* conspersio-  
 “ nem peccato originali, ergo *Christus universam re-*  
 “ *stituit*; noluimus tamen sententiam istam profer-  
 “ re, cum quod nonnulla videntur ob stare, tum quod  
 “ non videam, an aliqui eam tenuerunt; sed hoc mo-  
 “ do dixi, *Christianorum liberos damnare non posse pecca-*  
 “ *tum originale*, hac ex causa, quod, etsi peccatum fe-  
 “ cundum legem quidem damnet, tamen *propter re-*  
 “ *medium per Christum exhibitum damnare non potest*,  
 “ hos præsertim, *qui in eo Testamento sunt, quod cum*  
 “ *Abrahamo pepigit.* Nam de his alia quoque firma et  
 “ clara testimonia habemus; de aliis, *qui sunt extra Ec-*  
 “ *clesiam nati*, non habemus aliud quam *præsens testi-*  
 “ monium, quod ego sciam, et similia hoc quinto  
 “ Rom. capite, quo probari possit eos, qui *extra Eccle-*  
 “ *siam nascuntur*, mundos esse ab originali contamina-  
 “ tione. Quod si quis de his quoque dicet *probabilius*  
 “ *esse, ut Gentium liberi per Christum servantur, quam ut*  
 “ *damnentur*, jam certe minus evacuabit *Christum*, quam  
 “ hi, qui intra Ecclesiam natos damnant, si extra lava-  
 “ crum baptismi moriantur; et plus auctoritatis ac  
 “ fundamenti habebit in Scripturis, quam hi, qui hoc  
 “ negant. Nam is nihil aliud assereret, quam *Genti-*  
 “ *lium quoque liberos, dum teneri sunt, propter vitium ori-*  
 “ *ginale non damnari, id autem beneficio Christi*; adultis  
 “ autem nihil gratiæ reliquum esse eo, quod non fide-

"rent Christo. Si vero operibus ostenderent legem in  
 "cordibus suis esse scriptam, neque falleret hypocri-  
 "fis, jam satis auditum est eos inter circumcisos com-  
 "putandos esse, ubi enim opera fiunt Deo digna, *isthic*  
 "*dudum fuit in Deum religio*. Probant hoc Jethro,  
 "cujus pietas sic cœlesti sapientia imbuerat, ut etiam  
 "Mosi, qui coram cum Deo loquebatur, in condendis  
 "legibus esse auxilio; et Cornelius Centurio, cujus  
 "Deus eleemosynas orationesque respexit, antequam  
 "Evangelium ei esset expositum. Diceret igitur ali-  
 "quis per Christum *naturam esse restitutam*, jam ea  
 "sequerentur, quæ diximus; si vero *Ecclesiam* tantum,  
 "jam sequeretur, *non tam patere salutem per Christum,*  
 "*quam late grassatur morbus ex Adam.*" Ibid. p. 121.  
 "Iste locus, 'quod sine fide impossibile sit Deo placere,'  
 "synecdochicos intelligi debet, de his modo, qui ver-  
 "bum audiunt ac resiliunt, aut qui audiunt ac reci-  
 "piunt. Qui vero per ætatem non audiunt, his uni-  
 "versalibus non continentur. Apud illos nulla est  
 "prævaricatio, cum nulla sit apud eos lex. Si vero ex  
 "Christianis prognati sunt, jam virtute testamenti filii  
 "Dei sunt: sin ex Gentibus, jam nihil decernimus.  
 "Quamquam autem, ut ingenue fatear, *mibi magis ar-*  
 "*ridet ea sententia, quæ virtute mortis Christi omnium in-*  
 "*nocentium salutem acceptam fert*. Sic enim paria sunt,  
 "ubi abundavit delictum, ibi exundavit gratia. Si  
 "quæres, quomodo possunt hæc fieri? Hoc modo.  
 "*Quicquid uspiam mortalium nascitur salvum est per*  
 "*Christum.*" Epist. Urbano Regio, vol. i. p. 383.  
 The tenet of Zuingle, with the argument upon which  
 it was founded, seems to have been received by all his  
 followers. We find Bullinger, not long after his  
 death, (viz. in 1535.) speaking thus unreservedly upon  
 the subject, in a dialogue, which at the time was pub-  
 lished against the errors of the Anabaptists: "Joiada.  
 "Annon

“ Annon jamdudum audis pueros, etiamſi fateri fidem  
 “ non poſſunt, inter fideles tamen eſſe accenſos? Aut  
 “ Deus adultorum tantum Deus eſt? Et non puerorum?  
 “ An pro adultis duntaxat paſſus eſt Chriſtus, non etiam  
 “ pro pueris? *Simon. Paſſus eſt pro expiatione omnium pec-*  
 “ *catorum totius mundi. Joiada. Puerine habent peccata?*  
 “ *Simon. Originale peccatum habent. Quandoquidem*  
 “ *ergo Paulus per Chriſtum inſtauratum dicit quidquid*  
 “ *per Adam erat collapſum, nec adulti tantum, verum*  
 “ *etiam pueri in Adamo perſiti ſunt, conſequitur et*  
 “ *pueros per Chriſtum inſtauratos eſſe. Si reſtituti ſunt*  
 “ *pueri per Chriſtum, Dei ſunt.*” Adverſus omnia Cala-  
 baptiſtarum prava dogmata, p. 57. “ *Simon. Ex hoc*  
 “ *conſequens eſſet, infantes, qui ſine baptiſmo decedunt,*  
 “ *damnatos haudquaquam eſſe. Joiada. Plane conſequi-*  
 “ *tur.*” Ibid. p. 59.

Upon the whole, Zuingle believed, that all infants, without exception, dying before the commiſſion of actual crime, are heirs of the kingdom of Heaven; Luther, all born of thoſe who are themſelves within the Chriſtian Covenant, leaving the fate of Heathen children to the revelation of God's mercies in a future life; but Calvin, only ſuch as the Almighty has been pleaſed to diſtinguiſh by a myſterious decree of perſonal election.

*Page 70, note (18).*

See note 10. Our own Reformers were ſo far from embracing every favourable opportunity of expatiating upon human depravity, that even where others had introduced it, and where, if ever, it ſhould be diſplayed in its ſtrongeſt colours, viz. in our addreſſes to the throne of grace, they deſignedly avoided all alluſion to it. I have pointed out in Sermon I. note 7. the ſource, from which the confeſſion in our daily Prayer, at leaſt the idea of it, was taken. The words in the  
original

original are these: "Domine Deus, æterne et omnipotens, agnoscimus et fatemur ingenue apud sanctissimam majestatem tuam, peccatores esse nos miseros, *adeoque a prima origine, qua concepti et nati sumus, tam ad omne malum esse pronos, quam ab omni bono alienos, quo vitio tuas leges sanctissimas assidue transgredimur, eoque nobis exitium justissimo tuo judicio conquirimus.*" Totally silent upon the point of innate corruption, our Reformers, in their imitation of this passage, touched only upon that of actual transgression. "Almighty and most merciful Father, we have *erred and strayed* from thy ways, like lost sheep: we have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts: we have *offended* against thy holy laws: we have *left undone* those things which we ought to have done; and we have *done* those things which we ought *not to have done*: and there is no health in us."

But in the confession of our Communion Service, this deviation is still more striking, because the resemblance in other respects is closer. I have remarked, that where our Offices vary from the ancient forms, they are in general modeled after a Liturgy compiled by Melancthon and Bucer, for the archbishopric of Cologne, and often literally translated from it. The original, in the case before us, commences thus: "Omnipotens, æterne Deus, Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, creator rerum omnium, judex cunctorum hominum, agnoscimus et deploramus *nos in peccatis conceptos et natos, ideoque ad quævis mala pronos, et abhorrentes a veris bonis, sancta tua præcepta sine fide et modo transgressos esse, contemptu tui et verbi tui, dissidentia opis tuæ, fiducia nostri et mundi, pravis studiis et operibus, quibus majestatem tuam gravissimè me offendimus, et proximos nostros lædimus.* Ita-

que



“que in mortem æternam magis et magis nos ipsi se-  
 “pelimus et perdimus. Id vero nobis ex animo dolet,  
 “&c.” In our own confession, evidently grounded  
 upon this, the fervor of which is in no degree abated  
 by its moderation and propriety, we perceive that the  
 subject of inherent depravity is wholly omitted: “Al-  
 “mighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,  
 “maker of all things, judge of all men, we acknow-  
 “ledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness,  
 “which we from time to time most grievously have  
 “committed by thought, word, and deed, against thy  
 “divine Majesty, provoking most justly thy wrath and  
 “indignation against us. We do earnestly repent,  
 “and are heartily sorry for these our misdoings, &c.”

A similar omission likewise again occurs in the same  
 Service. Immediately after the short address, “It is  
 “very meet, right, and our bounden duty, &c:” which  
 was the exact form of the Romish Church, the follow-  
 ing passage is inserted in the Liturgy of Cologne:  
 “Per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Per quem  
 “nos ex nihilo ad imaginem tuam condidisti, et reli-  
 “quas creaturas omnes nostris utilitatibus addixisti,  
 “*cumque per peccatum Adæ a te deficientes inimici tui,*  
 “*et ideo morti et damnationi æternæ obnoxii facti essemus,*  
 “tu, ex infinita tua misericordia et ineffabili caritate,  
 “eundem Filium tuum, Verbum æternum, in hunc  
 “mundum misisti, &c.” Of this not the slightest  
 trace is to be found in our own Liturgy.

When our Reformers, instead of eagerly embracing,  
 thus purposely avoided, the opportunities afforded them  
 of constantly dwelling upon the original corruption of  
 human nature, to what motive can their conduct be  
 attributed, except to that of wishing to obviate on  
 this, as on every other occasion, even the suspicion of  
 patronising an extreme?

*Page 71, note (19).*

See note I. “Quod si has tantas vires habet humana natura, ut per sese possit diligere Deum super omnia, ut confidenter affirmant Scholastici, *quid erit peccatum originis? Quorsum autem opus erit gratia Christi, si nos possumus fieri justi propria iustitia?*” Apologia Confess. art. de Peccato Originali. “Hæ persuasiones regnabant et alebant fiduciam humanarum virium, et opprimebant cognitionem gratiæ Christi.” Ibid.

---

## NOTES

### ON SERMON IV.

Page 73, note (¹).

**HIC** adversarii opponunt exemplum Cornelii . . . . . Cornelius, inquiunt, teste Luca, vir bonus, justus, timens Deum, faciens eleemosynas multis populo, et deprecans Deum semper, *ergo merebatur de congruo remissionem peccatorum*. . . . . Errant igitur sophistæ, cum dicunt, pro statuendo opere congrui Cornelium operibus naturalibus rationis et moralibus consecutum esse gratiam, et remissionem Spiritus Sancti. Nam justum et timentem Dei, &c. esse, affectus sunt non hominis Gentilis aut naturalis, sed spiritualis, *qui jam fidem habet*. Nisi enim crederet Deum, timeret Deum, non speraret se oratione aliquid ab eo impetraturum. Lutheri Opera, vol. v. p. 330.

Page 77, note (²).

The idea of the Scholastics upon the inefficacy of our natural powers to merit a supernatural reward, without divine assistance, may be seen in their various comments upon the 24th and the 29th distinctions of the second book of the “Libri Sententiarum.” Lombard however himself seems to have been sufficiently explicit upon the subject: “Nunc diligenter investigari oportet, quam gratiam vel potentiam habuerit homo *ante casum*; et utrum per eam potuerit stare, vel non. Sciendum est ergo, quod homini *in creatione*

"tione (sicut de angelis diximus) datum est per gratiam auxilium, et collata est potentia, per quam poterat *flare*, id est, *non declinare ab eo, quod acceperat*; sed non poterat *proficere in tantum, ut per gratiam creationis sine alia mereri salutem valeret*. Poterat quidem *per illud auxilium gratiæ creationis resistere malo, sed non perficere bonum*. Poterat quidem *per illud bene vivere quodammodo, quia poterat vivere sine peccato, sed non poterat sine alio gratiæ adjutorio, spiritualiter vivere, quo vitam mereretur æternam.*" Lib. Sentent. lib. ii. distinct. 24. "Post hæc confiderandum est, utrum homo *ante peccatum* eguerit gratia operante et cooperante. Ad quod breviter dicimus, quod *non cooperante tantum, sed etiam operante gratia* indigebat; non quidem secundum omnem operandi modum operantis gratiæ; operatur enim liberando et præparando voluntatem hominis ad bonum. Egebat itaque homo ea, non ut liberaret voluntatem suam, quæ peccati serva non fuerat; sed ut præpararet ad volendum *efficaciter* bonum, quod *per se* non poterat. Non enim poterat *bonum mereri sine gratia*. . . . Ecce his verbis satis ostenditur, quod *ante peccatum* homo indigebat gratia operante et cooperante. Non enim habebat, *quo pedem movere posset*, sine gratiæ operantis et cooperantis auxilio; habuit tamen, *quo poterat flare.*" Ibid. distinct. 29.

The consideration of Original Righteousness, as a superadded gift, has already been noticed in Serm. III. note 4.

Page 78, note (3).

It was the universal sentiment of the Schools, that fallen man is both capable of preparing himself for the reception of grace, and of deserving it by his own virtue: "Quod homo possit se præparare ad gratiam sine novo dono habituali, sibi divinitus infuso, omnes concedunt."

“cedunt.” Durandus A. Sanct. Porc. In Sentent. lib. ii. distinct. 28. quæst. 3. “Hoc supposito, dicendum est, quod ad merendum solum de congruo non est necessarium ponere in nobis gratiam vel caritatem habitualement, quod patet, quia, *secundum omnes*, peccator carens gratia *pœnitendo meretur de congruo gratiam justificantem.*” Id. lib. i. dist. 16. quæst. 2.

In what sense the Scholastical grace, or charity, was deemed requisite to render merit complete, or convert that, which before was “meritum de congruo,” into “meritum de condigno,” the writings of Luther abundantly shew: “Principium fidei illorum capitale est hujusmodi, *Hominem posse ex naturalibus viribus, faciendo quod in se est, implere omnia mandata Dei.*

“Ex quo capite, quæ membra pendeant, vide. Primum, quod gratia Dei hominibus non est necessaria *ex parte facientis, neque ex parte faciendorum,* (quod etiam rotundis verbis impudenter habent eorum libri,) *sed ex parte exactoris Dei,* ut qui mandata sua impleri non est contentus, nisi *in gratia* impleantur. Ex quo ulterius sequitur cœlum esse clausum, et infernum paratum homini summa iniquitate Dei, nempe non propter peccata hominis, neque propter non impleta mandata Dei, sed propter tyrannicam et arbitriariam exactionem Dei. . . .

“Breviter, quicquid Christus est, et in Christo nobis donatum est, superfluum et non necessarium est, si nos et naturalia nostra spectes, sed necessarium solum, si Dei exactionem spectes. . . .

“Christum plane non necessarium facitis, et ex parte nostra. Ideo aperte negatis ipsum esse Jesum, id est, *Salvátorem hominum.* Afferitis autem, potius *Satisfactorem exactionis iniqui Dei.* Nec liberavit nos a peccatis, quæ nulla sunt, si liberum arbitrium velit facere, quod est in se, sed ab exactione ultra peccata  
“et

“ et mandata in homines sæviente. Ecce corpus sa-  
 “ cræ theologiæ Parrhiensis, et Papistarum ex latere  
 “ uno.

“ Ex alio latere, aliud principium fidei, *Hominem*  
 “ *posse, faciendo quod est in se, infallibiliter et necessario*  
 “ *mereri gratiam de congruo.*

“ Nonne sic docetis Almæ facultates? Docetis ergo  
 “ per hoc posse nos satisfacere *ex nobis* etiam iniquæ  
 “ Dei tyrannidi, ut misero et superfluo Christo non re-  
 “ liquus sit saltem blasphemissimus ille honor, quo non  
 “ Salvator hominum, seu Jesus, sed Satisfactor divini  
 “ tyranni et exactoris diceretur. Jam enim *nos ipsi gra-*  
 “ *tiam possumus absque Mediatore* impetrare. Ac si  
 “ jam *bis* superfluus est Christus, *nec necessarius etiam*  
 “ *ex parte Dei exactoris.*

“ Vereor autem ne lector pius non credat hæc hor-  
 “ rendis horribiliora doceri in Academiis. Quapropter  
 “ te oro, Christiane frater, vera me credas loqui; *testes*  
 “ *invoco eorum libros extantes*, et conscientias tum ipso-  
 “ rummet, tum omnium, qui legerunt eorum libros.”  
 Opera Lutheri, vol. ii. p. 265.

“ Quando homo facit aliquod bonum opus, illud  
 “ Deus acceptat, et pro illo opere infundit ei carita-  
 “ tem. *Hanc infusam caritatem* dicunt esse *qualitatem*  
 “ *hærentem in corde*, eamque vocant *formalem justitiam*.  
 “ . . . Eum, qui hanc habet, dicunt *formaliter* esse jus-  
 “ tum. Deinde etiam *effective*, quia jam bona opera  
 “ facit, quibus debetur vita æterna. Hæc est sophista-  
 “ rum opinio, et eorum, qui *optimi* sunt.

“ Alii non sunt tam boni, ut Scotus et Occam, qui  
 “ dixerunt, *non* opus esse pro acquirenda gratia Dei ca-  
 “ ritate illa *divinitus* donata; sed hominem posse *ex*  
 “ *naturalibus viribus* elicere caritatem Dei super om-  
 “ nia. . . .

“ Accusant Deum esse sævum tyrannum et crudelem  
 “ *exac-*

“ exactorem, qui non est contentus, quod servo et im-  
 “ pleo legem suam, sed *ultra* legem, quam bene im-  
 “ plere possum, etiam exigit, ut *circumstantia et ornatu,*  
 “ *seu vestitu quodam,* impleam. . . .

“ Sed hic distinctionem faciunt, ne videantur contra-  
 “ ria asserere, et dicunt legem *dupliciter* impleri. Pri-  
 “ mum *secundum substantiam facti*, deinde secundum in-  
 “ *entionem præcipientis*. Secundum substantiam facti,  
 “ id est, *quoad rem ipsam*, possumus *simpliciter* implere  
 “ omnia, quæ lex præcipit; sed non secundum inten-  
 “ tionem præcipientis, quæ est, quod Deus non est  
 “ contentus te fecisse et implexisse omnia, quæ in lege  
 “ mandata sunt, *quanquam non habeat, quod amplius*  
 “ *exigit*, sed *ultra* hoc exigit, ut *in caritate* legem fa-  
 “ cias, *non naturali*, quam habeo, sed *supernaturali et*  
 “ *divina*, quam ipse dat. Quid hoc aliud est, quam  
 “ ex Deo facere tyrannum et carnificem, qui hoc exi-  
 “ git a nobis, quod præstare non possumus. Et parum  
 “ abfuit, quin manifeste dicerent, non fieri *nostra culpa*,  
 “ quod damnemur, sed *Dei*, quod ista circumstantia  
 “ exigit legem suam a nobis impleri.” Id. vol. v.  
 p. 308.

“ Hic dico primum tales magistros gratiæ Dei nihil  
 “ tribuere præter *ornatum quendam* operibus nostris,  
 “ *non ut sanet ægros, sed ut ornet fortes*. Opera possu-  
 “ mus facere, sed non *colorata*. Et ita gratia est res vi-  
 “ lissima, non necessarium propter nos, sed propter vo-  
 “ luntatem et intentionem præcipientis, ut dicunt.” Idem,  
 vol. i. p. 198.

“ Secundum intentionem præcipientis requiri non  
 “ solum opus, sed *habitum in corde*, qui vocatur gra-  
 “ tia. Perinde ac si dicam, eum, qui manibus ac pe-  
 “ dibus valet, recte posse obire suum munus, sed id  
 “ impediri eo, quod non simul *indutus nigra aut can-*  
 “ *dida toga*.” Id. vol. iii. p. 452.

Page 79, note (\*).

Although merit *de congruo* was usually defined to be only meritum *secundum quid*, and not meritum *simpliciter*, (see the Comments of the Schools upon dist. 27. lib. ii. Sentent.) remunerable only by the liberality of the donor, yet was it always maintained to be *infallibly and necessarily* rewarded in conformity with the divine attributes. It was considered as a merit, which God is not compelled in strict justice, but from the nature of his immutable Deity, to respect: “Ad hunc modum docent homines mereri remissionem peccatorum, faciendo quod est in se. . . . Hæc opinio, quia naturaliter blanditur hominibus, peperit et auxit multos cultus in Ecclesia, vota monastica, abusus Missæ; et subinde alii alios cultus atque observationes hac opinione excogitaverunt. Et ut fiduciam talium operum alerent atque augerent, affirmaverunt Deum *necessario* gratiam dare sic operanti, necessitate non *coactionis*, sed *immutabilitatis*.” Apolog. Confess. p. 5. “Cum igitur,” observed Luther, “clara testimonia extant, quod homo malus et a Deo aversus sit, quis tam est amens ut dicere auserit, *naturalia in homine mansisse integra*? Hoc enim idem est ac si dicas, hominis naturam adhuc integram et bonam esse, quam tot exemplis discimus et experimur extreme esse vitiatam.

“Ex hac prava sententia multa periculosa dicta nata sunt, quædam etiam manifeste falsa et impia; ut cum dicunt, Quando homo facit quod in se est, tum Deus *infallibiliter* dat gratiam. Hoc quasi classico excitaverunt homines ad orationes, jejunia, afflictiones corporum, ad peregrinationes, et alia similia. Sic enim persuasum fuit mundo, si homines facerent quantum possent natura, mereri gratiam, si non de condigno, tamen de congruo. Meritum congrui autem

“tem



“tem eo retulerunt, quod opus non esset *contra* le-  
 “gem Dei, sed *secundum* legem Dei. Nam malo non  
 “debetur meritum, sed pœna. *Condigni* meritum tri-  
 “buerunt *non operi*, sed *qualitati operis*, si fieret ex gra-  
 “tia.” Lutheri Opera, vol. vi. p. 109.

“Damnanda est igitur pernicioſa et impia opinio  
 “Papistarum, qui tribuunt operi operato *meritum gra-*  
 “*tiae, et remissionem peccatorum*. Dicunt enim opus bo-  
 “num ante gratiam valere ad impetrandam gratiam de  
 “congruo. Impetrata jam gratia, sequens opus me-  
 “reri vitam æternam de condigno. Exempli gratia,  
 “homo existens in peccato mortali, sine gratia, si bona  
 “naturali intentione faciat opus bonum, id est, legat  
 “vel audiat Missum, det eleemosynam, &c. is meretur  
 “gratiam de congruo. Impetrata hoc modo gratia  
 “de congruo, jam facit opus condignum, et merito-  
 “rium vitæ æternæ. *In primo* quidem Deus *non est*  
 “*debitor*, sed quia est *bonus et justus, decet eum, ut ap-*  
 “*probet* tale opus, etiam in peccato mortali factum, et  
 “reddat pro tali officio gratiam. *Post gratiam* autem  
 “*jam* factus est Deus *debitor*, et *jure* cogitur dare vi-  
 “tam æternam. Quia jam non solum est opus liberi  
 “arbitrii factum secundum substantiam, sed etiam fac-  
 “tum in gratia gratificante, id est, in dilectione. Hæc  
 “est theologia regni Antichristiani.” Id. vol. v. p. 306.

Page 80, note (5).

“Hinc intuli omnia, quæ ad veritatem hanc sequun-  
 “tur, licet tibi indignissima visa (quod miror;) nem-  
 “pe, quod tres sectas Scholasticorum doctorum nobi-  
 “liores negaris, qui liberum arbitrium ante gratiam  
 “nullum actum *meritorium*, tamen actum, qui *non sit*  
 “*peccatum*, et qui gratiam de congruo mereatur, tri-  
 “buunt.” Epist. Luther. ad Eccium. Opera, vol. i.  
 p. 354.

“Ista conclusio pendet ex eo fundamento, quod om-

“nis actus humanus aut est bonus, aut malus, nec datur *actus neuter*, seu, ut illi dicunt, *moraliter bonus*.  
 “Ideo primum mihi sunt amolienda duo, quæ his ap-  
 “poni solent.

“Primum est *auctoritas Scholæ omnium fere theologo-  
 rum per orbem, qui contra sentiunt*.” Id. vol. i. p. 299.  
 See Serm. III. note 5.

It should be observed, that this neutral act of our unaided powers, although strictly denominated neither good nor bad, was nevertheless supposed to be good in all its natural circumstances, (being deficient only in a certain supernatural quality,) to be acceptable to heaven, and meritorious in every point of view, except in that of deserving eternal life.

*Page 81, note (6).*

Tale etiam est Scoti dictum, quod homo ex puris naturalibus possit diligere Deum super omnia. Fundamentum enim hujus est, quod naturalia sunt integra. Sic autem colligit. Homo puellam diligit, quæ est creatura; sic autem perditæ diligit, ut se et vitam suam pro ea in discrimine ponat. Sic mercator diligit opes, et quidem tam impense, ut mille mortis pericula subeat, dummodo lucrari aliquid posset. Si igitur tantum creaturarum amor est, quæ longe infra Deum sunt positæ, quanto magis amabit homo Deum, qui summum bonum est? Ergo ex puris naturalibus diligi potest Deus.

Bella consequentia, et digna Franciscano Monacho!  
 Lutheri Opera, vol. vi. p. 109.

*Page 82, note (7).*

In hac contradictione perpetua vivit *totus papatus et omnes Scholæ sophistarum*. Nolunt agnoscere se nihil nisi peccatores esse; sed contendunt, *Rationem habere suum lumen integrum*, et si quid vitii sit in natura, *inferiorem* tantum portionem corruptam esse, eam trahi li-  
 bidine

bidine et concupiscentia, sed *superiorem portionem habere inextinguibilem et puram lucem.*" Lutheri Opera, vol. iii. p. 462.

No tenet of the Schools proved more offensive to the Lutherans, who were anxious to erect their system of faith, not upon a Philosophical, but Scriptural foundation, than that of the integrity of human nature after the transgression of Adam. "Quod igitur Scholastici dicunt naturalia esse integra, magna ea blasphemia est, quanquam illa adhuc major est, quod etiam de dæmonibus idem judicant. Si enim naturalia essent integra, quid opus esset Christo? Deinde si homo *naturaliter* habet *bonam voluntatem*, si habet *intellectum verum*, cui se voluntas, ut ipsi loquuntur, naturaliter potest conformare; quid tandem illud, quod in Paradiso per peccatum amissum, per solum Filium Dei restitui necesse fuit? Et tamen sententiam hanc quidem, ut videntur, magistri theologi nostra ætate defendunt, quod *naturalia sunt integra*, id est, quod *voluntas sit bona*, et si aliquando per malitiam vult aut cogitat aliud, quam quod rectum et bonum est, tribuunt id *malitiæ hominum*, non simpliciter *voluntati, sicut in se est.*" Lutheri Opera, vol. iii. p. 452.

"Ipsi naturæ tribuunt, quod gratiæ Dei est, quod ferendum non sit. Deinde securos faciunt homines, ne peccatum expurgent. Minuunt etiam mysterii Christi notitiam per hoc, et laudem et amorem Dei, dum non considerant effusissimæ gratiæ bonitatem super peccatores expensam, sed *innocentem naturam faciunt.*" Id. vol. ii. p. 238.

With such ideas therefore of man's integrity, the Scholastics, as Melancthon justly observed, conceived the influence of God's Holy Spirit to be superfluous; not calculated to purify that, which was before im-

pure, but simply exerted to display the divine complacency in human virtue: "Censent philosophi absolute tam virtutem in homine *assuetudine* parari. Contra divinæ literæ docent humana omnia polluta esse peccato, nec purgari, nisi *Spiritu, quam Christus emeruit generi humano*. . . . Scholæ theologorum philosophos secutæ, virtutem parari posse viribus humanis docent: Spiritum accedere, ut *se in nobis jam nostro Marte purgatis oblectet, non ut suo numine transformet ac purget animos*. . . . Theologicas vero virtutes, nequid divino Spiritu relinquunt, fingunt alias divinitus in nos effundi, alias a nobis parari. Deinde plane ociosas in nobis *stertere* eas, quæ *divinitus inspiratæ sunt*, *vigere vero, quas nos paravimus*." Melancthonis Opera, vol. ii. p. 51.

"Scilicet obnoxiam fecistis rationem Evangelio, deprelire Thoma, et tu, somniator Scote, cum docuistis citra divini Spiritus auxilium *posse singula lethalia peccata vitari*. Agnoscis, Thoma, placitum tuum? Sic enim ais; 'Antequam *ratio*, in qua est mortale peccatum, reparetur per gratiam justificantem *potest singula peccata mortalia vitare*.' Hoccine est in Christi obsequium vincere intellectum humanum? Diversa enim docuit ille, ut apud Johannem scriptum est, cum ait, 'Sine me nihil potestis facere.' Quæ est igitur insania docere, quod *citra Christi spiritum vitari peccatum possit*? Tu vero, Occame, deliciæ quondam nostræ, quid sentiebas, quum disputares, 'Gratia opus esse ad justificationem, neque rationem, neque Scripturam, neque experientiam testari? Agnoscis, opinor, dogma tuum.'" Ibid. p. 58.

Page 83, note (\*).

Quisque Monachus hanc habet imaginationem: "Ego per observantiam sanctæ regulæ possum mereri gratiam de congruo; operibus autem, quæ post acceptam

“ ceptam gratiam facio, tantum meritum accumulare  
 “ possum, ut non tantum mihi sufficiat pro consequen-  
 “ da vita æterna, sed etiam hoc aliis communicare  
 “ et vendere possim.” Sic docuerunt et vixerunt om-  
 nes Monachi. Lutheri Opera, vol. v. p. 307.

Page 84, note (°).

That the Lutherans represented the doctrine of congruous merit as striking at the very root of Christianity, appears evident from almost every page of their writings; and sufficiently, perhaps, from the extracts already made. It may nevertheless be not improper to add one or two more directly to the point. “ Si-  
 “ militer Evangelion prædicat Christum Salvatorem  
 “ nostrum; id audiunt et recipiunt. At dogmatis suis  
 “ juxta inventis evacuant, et annihilant omnia propria  
 “ Christi opera et beneficia, dum docent, homines ex  
 “ viribus et operibus naturæ gratiam posse mereri.  
 “ Hoc dogmate sane Christum rejiciunt cum omnibus ope-  
 “ ribus suis; id quod de eis Petrus prædixit in poste-  
 “ riore Epistola, capite secundo, ubi ait, ‘ Surgent in  
 ‘ vobis falsi doctores, qui Deum negabunt, qui ipsos  
 ‘ redemit.’ Nam si natura suo Marte potest gratiam  
 “ mereri, quod modo omnes Academiæ, Collegia, et  
 “ Cœnobita, uno ore cum Papa sentiunt, et docent,  
 “ Christus profecto frustra et natus et mortuus est. Ad  
 “ quid enim sanguinem suum profudisset, ad promie-  
 “ rendum nobis gratiam, si ipsam viribus naturæ posse-  
 “ mus consequi?” Postillæ Majores Lutheri, p. 153.  
 “ Finge, inquam, quod faciendo, quod in te est, acqui-  
 “ ras gratiam, sis justus, habeas Spiritum. Unde? Ex  
 “ merito congrui? Ergo non opus habes Christo, sed tibi  
 “ ociosus et gratis mortuus est. . . .

“ Hoc stante, necessario sequitur Christum gratis  
 “ esse mortuum. Quid enim homo opus habet Chris-  
 “ to, qui amet eum, et tradat seipsum pro eo, cum sine

“ Christo per meritum congrui possit consequi gratiam.  
 “ Et deinde bene operari, et vitam æternam de con-  
 “ digno mereri, aut certe faciendo legem, justificari ?  
 “ *Tollatur igitur Christus cum omnibus beneficiis suis, quia*  
 “ *omnino ociosus est.* At cur Christus nascitur, crucifi-  
 “ gitur, moritur ? Cur sit Pontifex meus diligens, et  
 “ tradens inæstimabilem hostiam, seipsum, pro me ?  
 “ Cur ista omnia facit ? *Simpliciter frustra*, si ratio justi-  
 “ ficationis, quam sophistæ tradunt, vera est ; quia in  
 “ lege aut in me iustitiam invenio *extra gratiam et*  
 “ *Christum.*” Opera Lutheri, vol. v. p. 322.

The same sentiment likewise not only occurs in the  
 Apology of the Augsbourg Confession, but is thus  
 repeated in the Articles of Smalcald, drawn up by Lu-  
 ther, and signed by the German Reformers in the year  
 1537. “ Talia et similia portenta orta sunt ex incitia  
 “ et ignorantia peccati, et Christi Servatoris nostri ;  
 “ suntque vere et mere Ethnica dogmata, quæ tolerari  
 “ non possumus. Si enim ista approbantur, *Christus*  
 “ *frustra mortuus est*, cum nullum peccatum et dam-  
 “ num sit in homine, pro quo mori eum oportuerit ;  
 “ aut solummodo *pro corpore* mortuus diceretur, non  
 “ *pro anima*, quandoquidem anima *prorsus sana*, et so-  
 “ lum corpus morti obnoxium perhibetur.” Liber  
 Concordiæ, p. 318. ed. 1606.

Page 86, note (1°).

This proposition, generally expressed in the same  
 terms, and always conveying the same meaning, perpe-  
 tually occurs in the controversies of Luther. Even be-  
 fore his celebrated disputation with Eccius, he at-  
 tempted to bring it forward to public notice. In the  
 year 1516, while his name was yet unknown in the  
 world at large, he introduced it into a logical question  
 upon the powers and will of man : “ Homo, quando  
 “ facit quod in se est, peccat,” was a corollary in his  
 second

second conclusion upon the subject. *Quæstio de viribus et voluntate hominis sine gratia. Opera, vol. i. p. 51.*

*Page 87, note (<sup>11</sup>).*

See note 5. “Sed et ipsum Dom. Doctorem credo “id ipsum asserere, *quod gratia et peccatum apud Scho-  
“lasticos immediate opponuntur.*” *Lutheri Opera, vol. i. p. 287.*

*Page 88, note (<sup>12</sup>).*

“At ego prorsus *nullum habeo medium inter peccatum  
“et gratiam.* Sicut nec Christus, quando dicit, ‘Qui  
“non est mecum, contra me est.’ Et iterum, ‘Aut fa-  
“cite arborem bonam, aut facite arborem malam.’ *Ibid.*  
Upon this point the Lutherans argued, not only that  
our nature is sinful, because impure, (“*peccatum signi-  
“ficat . . . vitiosam naturam,*” *Opera Lutheri, vol. i.  
p. 449. Mel. Disput.*) but that consequently our ac-  
tions also are sinful, because equally impure and im-  
perfect. And here they usually reasoned from the de-  
fects in our best virtues: “Si *justus* in gratia non po-  
“test facere bonum, *quin simul peccet,* quanto magis  
“*injustus non facit bonum?* At per hoc concludo, aut  
“bonum aut malum esse actum hominis quemcunque,  
“nec dari *actum medium et neutrum.*” *Opera Lutheri,  
vol. i. p. 300.* “Ut iterum ad Articulum Hassiticum  
“Constantiæ damnatum redeam; quantus error est *ac-  
“tum neutrum et non malum* inveniri dicere, quando  
“actus justorum non est justificabilis coram Deo?  
“Quibus recte illud Jerem. xlix. dici potest; ‘Ecce,  
“quibus judicium non erat, ut biberent, bibentes bi-  
“bent. Et tu innocens eris. Non eris innocens.’ Et  
“1 Pet. iv. 4. ‘Si justus vix salvabitur, peccator et  
“impius ubi parebunt?’

“Et vide *monstra,* quæ sequuntur. *Impio extra gra-  
“tiam, in suo opere bono, tribuunt nec veniale pecca-  
“tum,*

“*tum, sed solummodo non meritorium, cum hic iusto*  
 “*in opere bono tribuatur adeo peccatum, ut, si iudicio*  
 “*Dei sistatur, non possit justificari, (hoc est mortale et*  
 “*damnabile).* Quanto ergo magis impii opera bona  
 “*sunt damnabilia et mortalia, nequaquam neutralia seu*  
 “*media.*” Oper. Luth. vol. i. p. 303.

It should be recollected, that the precise object of this controversy was not to ascertain what man is entitled to, or what he is capable of effecting with the aids of Christianity, but what his claims and abilities are without them. In this exact point of view the Schools had always considered it. Hence, when the Lutherans argued, that our nature and actions are alike sinful, they contemplated both, as estimated *out of Christianity*, according to the just judgment of a righteous God, “who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.” “Cur” (Christus) “ista omnia facit? Simpliciter frustra, si ratio justificationis, quam sophistæ tradunt, vera est; quia in lege aut in me iustitiam invenio *extra gratiam et Christum.*” Opera Lutheri, vol. v. p. 322. “Illum syllogismum Apostoli dignum est perpendere, ‘Si per legem iustitia, &c.’ cum fiducia pronunciat, aut Christum esse mortuum, (quod est summa blasphemia in Deum,) aut per legem nihil nisi peccatum haberi. Nam illi *procul a sacris literis* arcendi sunt, qui distinctionibus *e suo cerebro* depromptis, *iustitiam aliam moralem, aliam fidei, et nescio quas alias ad theologiam* afferunt.

“Habeat sane *civilis res* suam iustitiam, *philosophi* suam, et *quicunque* suam. Nos oportet hic iustitiam ad intellectum Scripturæ accipere, quam Apostolus plane negat esse, *nisi per fidem Jesu Christi.* . . . Ne ergo in *theologia* iustitiam vocaveris, *quod extra fidem Christi* fuerit.” Id. vol. v. p. 232.

“Disputabant quidem” (viz. Scholastici) “de peccato  
 “origi-



“ originis, sed dicebant in baptismo sublatum esse ; et  
 “ *extra baptismum in natura lumen esse reliquum*, quod si  
 “ quis sequatur, dari infallibiliter gratiam.” Id. vol. iii.  
 p. 465. “ Quod si is non justificabitur in iudicio Dei,  
 “ qui servus Dei est, nec omnes viventes, inter quos  
 “ necesse est sanctissimos aliquot esse, si Ecclesiam  
 “ sanctam sanctorum communionem in terris vivere  
 “ credimus, qui tamen legem non implent ; qualis putas  
 “ furor est eorum, qui *citra gratiam et extra Ecclesiam*  
 “ insaniunt legem posse impleri ex naturalibus viribus,  
 “ quoad totam substantiam facti, licet non ad inten-  
 “ tionem præcipientis.” Id. vol. i. p. 302.

But while they pointed out the insufficiency of fallen man to perform, without Christianity, a service meritoriously acceptable to Almighty God, they withheld not from him a freedom of will, (or rather a natural competency,) in the external discharge of every moral obligation : “ Neque vero adimimus humanæ voluntati  
 “ libertatem. Habet humana voluntas libertatem in  
 “ operibus et rebus deligendis, *quas ratio per se compre-*  
 “ *bendit*. Potest aliquo modo efficere *justitiam civilem, seu*  
 “ *justitiam operum*. Potest loqui de Deo, exhibere Deo  
 “ certum cultum externo opere, obedire magistratibus,  
 “ parentibus, in opere externo eligendo. *Potest conti-*  
 “ *nere manus a cæde, ab adulterio, a furto*. Cum reliqua  
 “ sit in natura hominis ratio et iudicium de rebus sen-  
 “ sui subjectis, reliquus est etiam delectus earum rerum,  
 “ et libertas, et facultas efficiendæ justitiæ civilis. Id  
 “ enim vocat Scriptura justitiam carnis, quam natura car-  
 “ nalis, hoc est, ratio, per se efficit sine Spiritu Sancto.”  
 Apolog. Confess. p. 58. When therefore they denied the liberty of the will, they meant to deny, that it possesses the power of obtaining, independently of Christianity, the remission of sins, and eternal life. “ Hæc  
 “ tot ac tam multiplicia mala ex peccato per Satanam  
 “ enata,

“ enata, isti non vident, qui liberum arbitrium defen-  
 “ dunt. Etsi enim ratio *imperare sibi potest, ne consen-*  
 “ *tat omnibus cupiditatibus, quod attinet ad externum*  
 “ *opus, sæpe enim cohibet, sæpe moderatur vitiosos impe-*  
 “ *tus, id enim nisi aliquo modo in nobis esset positum,*  
 “ *quæ legum politicarum, quæ disciplinæ esset utilitas,*  
 “ *quam tamen tantopere divinitus commendari vider-*  
 “ *mus, (at docet experientia eam pæne solam efficere, ne*  
 “ *omnes pariter in cædes, adulteria, et alia vitia prolaba-*  
 “ *mur ;)* tamen inde effici non potest, quod sit arbi-  
 “ trium liberum, hoc est, *quod homo sine Spiritu Sancto*  
 “ *se gubernare recte facere, ac Deo commendare possit ; id*  
 “ *quod caput est, de quo liberi arbitrii defensores pugnant.*  
 “ Nam ipsa concupiscentia peccatum est, nec est otiosa,  
 “ sed perpetuo contra legem Dei sollicitat animos.  
 “ Vere igitur nihil boni est, si non per Spiritum Sanc-  
 “ tum prius corda fide purificata, et per remissionem  
 “ peccatorum nobiscum nata iniquitas sublata fuerit.  
 “ *Atqui hæc nostra ratio est, quod liberum arbitrium dici-*  
 “ *mus nullum esse, ac defendimus nihil esse boni, nec*  
 “ *posse ab homine aliquid boni fieri, nisi Spiritus Sanc-*  
 “ *tus eum regeneret. Sicut Ecclesia egregie profecto*  
 “ *canit de Spiritu ; ‘ Sine tuo Numine nihil est in ho-*  
 “ *mine, nihil est innoxium.’ Etsi enim externam disci-*  
 “ *plinam, quæ in arbitrio hominis aliquo modo posita*  
 “ *est, Deus exigit et probat, tamen hac non liberamur a*  
 “ *morte, non commendamur a Deo, ut remittat peccata, et*  
 “ *æternam vitam donet. Contingunt hæc tantum fide*  
 “ *ex merito Filii Dei, qui pro peccatis nostris sua morte*  
 “ *satisfecit.”* Lutskeri Opera, vol. iv. p. 335.

Page 89, note (<sup>13</sup>).

Vidi multos non Epicureos, qui, cum essent in ali-  
 quo mœrore propter suos lapsus, disputabant, quomodo  
 sperem me recipi, cum *non sentiam* in me transfundi  
 novam lucem et novas virtutes ? Præterea si *nihil* agit  
 liberum.

liberum arbitrium, interea, donec sensero fieri illam regenerationem, de qua dicitis, indulgebo diffidentiae, et aliis vitiosis affectibus. *Hæc Manichæa imaginatio horribile mendacium est*; et ab hoc errore mentes abducendæ sunt, et docendæ, *agere aliquid liberum arbitrium*. Loci Theologici, de libero Arbitrio, p. 92, 93.

Page 90, note (<sup>14</sup>).

The passage referred to is in a Preface to the first volume of his works, dated in the year 1545. In that very year likewise appeared the last amended edition of the Loci Communes Theologici. The following are the words of Luther: "Multum diuque restiti illis, qui meos libros, seu verius confusiones mearum lucubrationum, voluerunt editas; tumque nolui antiquorum labores meis novitatibus obrui, et lectorem a legendis illis impediri, tumque nunc Dei gratia extent methodici libri quamplurimi, *inter quos Loci Communes Philippi excellunt, quibus theologus et episcopus pulchre et abunde firmari potest, ut sit potens in sermone doctrinæ pietatis*, præsertim cum ipsa sacra biblia nunc in omni prope lingua haberi possint. Mei autem libri, ut ferebat, imo cogebat, rerum gerendarum nullus ordo, ita etiam ipsi sint quoddam rude et indigestum chaos, quod nunc nec mihi ipsi fit facile digerere.

"His rationibus adductus, cupiebam omnes libros meos perpetua oblivione sepultos, ut melioribus esset locus." In the same preface also he thus bears public testimony to the general utility of Melancthon's labours: "Eodem anno jam M. Philippus Melancthon a Principe Frederico vocatus huc fuerat ad docendas literas Græcas, haud dubie ut haberem socium laboris in theologia. Nam quid operatus sit Dominus per hoc organum, non in literis tantum, sed in theologia,"

“*gia, satis testantur ejus opera, etiamsi irascatur Satan,*  
 “*et omnes squamæ ejus.*”

The early opinions of Luther and Melancthon upon the doctrine of Necessity have been already adverted to in Serm. I. note 21. Harsh, however, as occasionally appear to have been the expressions of the former upon this head, his followers pertinaciously contend, that even the harshest cannot, with propriety, be construed into a sense favourable to the Calvinistical system. See Pet. Haberkornii Solida et Necessaria Vindicatio Lib. Art. Luther. Those of the latter, in the first editions of his *Loci Theologici*, although occurring but in one or two instances, were nevertheless still more offensive, and less capable of a mitigated interpretation. So far indeed did they carry the doctrine of divine Predetermination, as to degrade man to a level with the brutes: “*Postremo libertatem hominĩ*  
 “*adimit divina Prædestinatio. Eveniunt enim omnia*  
 “*juxta divinam prædestinationem, cum externa opera;*  
 “*tum internæ cogitationes in omnibus creaturis.*” Ed. 1525.

Without entering into the general question, which would lead me too far from the object at present in contemplation, it may be proper to observe, that even at the period alluded to Luther denied not either the resistibility of grace, or, in a certain sense, the coöperation of the human mind. The first seems evident from the following and other similar passages, in his early compositions: “*Spiritualis sabbatismus, quem*  
 “*Deus in hoc præcepto putavit, est, ut non solum la-*  
 “*bores et opificia omittamus, sed multo magis, ut per-*  
 “*mittamus duntaxat Deum in nobis operari, nihil pro-*  
 “*prie in omnibus nostris viribus operantes. Id verò*  
 “*jam non mihi evenit otio; sed hic vis facienda est*  
 “*naturæ,*

“naturæ, et *permittendum* ut ei vis fiat.” Opera, vol. v. p. 592. “Ut ita prorsus spiritualement sabbatismum celebremus, vacantes a nostris operibus, et *permittentes* Deum in nobis operari.” Ibid. p. 593. “Sed ut sabbatum sanctifices, mortuus sis ac sepultus, *snasque* Deum in te operari.” Vol. iii. p. 172. Here, while the mind is supposed to be passive during the act of forming a disposition to holiness, a kind of activity is maintained in submitting itself to such an operation.

The second point perhaps is no less clear from the very work, which some consider as purposely written to prove the contrary. In the tract “De servo Arbitrio,” composed by way of answer to an attack of Erasmus, under the title of “Diatribes, sive de libero Arbitrio,” after noticing his opponent’s argument upon the cooperation of the human mind with divine grace, expressed in various similitudes, Luther adds, “Sed dentur adhuc eadem opera et Deo et homini, quid efficiunt istæ similitudines? Nihil, nisi quod creatura operanti Deo cooperatur. At nunquid nos de *cooperatione* nunc disputamus, ac non potius de *propria vi et operatione liberi arbitrii*? . . . Sed non operatur in nobis *sine nobis*, ut quos ad hoc creavit et servavit, ut in nobis operaretur, et *nos ei cooperamur*, sive hoc fiat extra regnum suum generali omnipotentia, sive intra regnum suum singulari virtute Spiritus sui.” Opera, vol. ii. p. 474. In what sense Erasmus understood this passage, his reply, published under the title of Hyperaspistæ Diatribes, puts beyond a doubt: “Ego,” he remarks, “nihil tribui libero arbitrio, nisi quod se præbet gratiæ pulsanti, quod cooperatur gratiæ operanti, et quod ab utraque se potest avertere; semper excipio singularem Dei voluntatem, qui potest ex causis incognitis vi rapere, quocunque velit. Hæc eadem fatetur Augustinus, et tamen po-

“nit

“nit liberum arbitrium, et illi tribuit actionem. *Idem* “*fatetur Lutherus.*” Opera Erasmi, vol. x. p. 1480. ed. Lug. Bat. 1706.

But, more accurately to comprehend the sentiments of Luther, we must previously understand the specific point in dispute. This may be easily collected from the following Scholastical quotation: “Ordine naturæ talis dispositio præcedit gratiam; quod autem duratione simul sint talis dispositio et gratia, patet sic, “sicut est *in operibus naturæ*, in quibus *Deus* principaliter operatur *dando formam*, licet *agens naturale* cooperetur *disponendo materiam*, sic est *in operibus gratiæ*, in quibus *Deus* principaliter operatur *dando gratiam*, licet *liberum arbitrium* cooperetur *disponendo subjectum vel materiam*; sed in prædictis operibus naturæ videmus, quod disposita materia per agens naturale ultima dispositione statim a Deo introducitur forma, (ut patet in generatione hominis,) ergo in justificatione peccatoris, quod est opus gratiæ, in quo liberum arbitrium cooperatur Deo, (dicente Augustino, ‘qui creavit te sine te non te, &c.’) posita ultima dispositione per actum liberi arbitrii statim a Deo infunditur gratia, quæ est forma justificationis.” Durandus de S. Porciano. In Lib. Sentent. lib. iv. distinct. 17. quæst. 1. Here the preparation of the subject-matter for the reception of the form is distinctly assigned to free will alone, which is thus said to contribute by its own exertions a necessary requisite. This sole efficiency of free will Luther expressly opposed, frequently recalling the attention of his adversary to the only object of debate; an efficiency, which (as he conceived) renders divine cooperation superfluous; merely granted, “ut superbia liberi arbitrii, *per sese satis robusti*, gratia, velut superfluo oruamento, diebus Bacchanalibus gestiat et ludat.” Vol. ii. p. 475. de servo Arbitrio.

trio. “ Si enim liberum arbitrium de solo non potest  
 “ velle bonum, (*loquimur enim de libero arbitrio, seclusa*  
 “ *gratia, et utriusque propriam quærimus vim*) quis non  
 “ videt solius gratiæ esse bonam illam voluntatem,  
 “ meritum et præmium ?” Ibid. p. 453. “ Quid vero  
 “ dicit, quod homo *adjutus Dei auxilio* possit operibus  
 “ moralibus sese *præparare* ? Disputamusne *de divino*  
 “ *auxilio*, vel *de libero arbitrio* ? Quid enim non sit  
 “ possibile *divino auxilio* ?” Ibid. p. 469.

With the rejection therefore of all self-energy in free will thus to prepare itself to grace, the controversy properly terminated. But a subsequent question arose of a still more intricate description. Is the disposition to good produced wholly by grace, or conjointly with the operation of the human mind ? This implicated enquiry, foreign to the subject, was first introduced into it (not by the Lutherans themselves, but their most formidable opponent, the wily Eccius,) in the celebrated disputation of the year 1519. In an epistle written at the time, Melancthon thus alludes to the circumstance : “ Itaque die 27 mensis Junii,  
 “ congregiuntur Johannes Eccius et Carlostadius. De  
 “ libero arbitrio propositum est, ‘ An sit aliquod nobis  
 “ *αὐθαίρετον* bonum opus,’ hoc est, ut ipsi dicunt, ‘ An  
 “ de congruo mereamur gratiam, cum facimus quod in  
 “ nobis est.’ Utor enim ipsorum verbis. Hoc cum  
 “ agi deberet, vide *quorsum* contentione rapti sint, et  
 “ in quos scopulos impegerint. Agi debebat quid  
 “ *per sese citra gratiam* possit voluntas nostra. Ipsi  
 “ quæstionem alio rapiunt, et quatuor credo continuos  
 “ dies in eo disceptant, ‘ An voluntas *tantum recipiat*  
 “ bonum opus, ipsumque bonum *sola efficiat gratia*.’  
 “ In has symplegadas coegerunt causam, non ita mul-  
 “ tum necessarias, et *plane alienas ab instituto Carolo-*

“*stadii.*” Melanct. Epist. in Oper. Lutheri, vol. i. p. 337.

When Luther indeed touched upon this point, he certainly seemed to support the proposition, that the act of volition was solely derived from grace. At the same time however, it should be particularly observed, that he held the power of admitting or rejecting this operative principle to be vested in the mind of man, as well as that of cooperating with it in the production of every Christian virtue. On the first head the passages already quoted leave us no room to doubt his meaning. Upon the second, the following seem equally explicit. “*Sabbatismus autem, ut, operibus nostris cessantibus, Deus solus operetur, perficitur duobus modis. Primo per nostram propriam exercitationem, secundo per alienam externamque exercitationem, vel agitationem. Nostram igitur exercitationem sic oportet esse institutam et instructam, ut primo videntes quo sit nostra caro intenta, nostrique sensus, voluntas, et cogitationes nos irritent, eis resistamus ac minime obsequemur.*” Opera, vol. v. p. 592. “*Duplex est justitia Christianorum, sicut et duplex peccatum est hominum. Prima est aliena et ab extra infusa. . . . Secunda justitia est nostra et propria, non quod nos soli operemur eam, sed quod cooperemur illi primæ et alienæ. Hæc nunc est illa conversatio bona in operibus bonis; primo, in mortificatione carnis et crucifixione concupiscentiarum erga seipsum, sicut Galat. v. ‘Qui autem sunt Christi carnem suam crucifixerunt cum vitiis et concupiscentiis.’ Secundo, et in caritate erga proximum. Tertio, et in humilitate ac timore erga Deum. De quibus plenus est Apostolus et omnis Scriptura. Breviter autem omnia ad Titum ii. comprehendit, dicens, ‘Sobrie, (quoad se-*  
*ipsum*



‘*ipsum in carnis crucifixione,*) *et iuste,* (*quoad proximum,*)  
 ‘*et pie,* (*quoad Deum,*) *vivamus in hoc seculo.*” Opera,  
 vol. i. p. 69.

But as the subtle and perplexing turn, which this controversy first assumed in the public disputation with Eccius, ceased with the Hyperaspistæ of Erasmus in the year 1527, and was not revived among the Lutherans until after the æra when our Articles were composed, it appears not necessary to trace it more minutely. It seems only of importance to state what was considered to be the Lutheran opinion upon the point, between the two periods alluded to; upon the single point, whether the cooperation of free will with grace assisted in forming the disposition itself to good, or only in producing its effects. In no established code of doctrines was the question directly alluded to, but, when occasionally hinted at, apparently viewed in a light different from that, in which Luther had previously placed it. The first slight reference to it occurred in the Articles composed for the Visitation of the Saxon Churches, in which it was said, “Non  
 “*enim delectatur Deus ista vitæ feritate quorundam,*  
 “*qui cum audierint non justificari nos viribus et operi-*  
 “*bus, somniant se velle expectari, a Deo donec trahantur,*  
 “*interea vivunt impurissime; hi maximas pœnas da-*  
 “*bant Deo.*” Art. de Lege. In the Augsbourgh Confession the same hint is less obscurely, if not distinctly, given; which, after stating that the human will retains a certain liberty in moral actions, adds, “Sed  
 “*non habet vim sine Spiritu Sancto efficiendæ justitiæ*  
 “*Dei, seu justitiæ spiritualis;* 1 Cor. ii. 14. ‘*Quia*  
 “*animalis homo non percipit ea, quæ sunt Spiritus*  
 “*Dei;*’ sed hæc sit in cordibus, *cum per verbum Spiritus*  
 “*Sanctus concipitur;*” Art. 18. implying, that with  
 the Holy Spirit it is competent jointly to effect what,

without such an aid, would prove impossible. And again, in a paragraph quoted from St. Auſtin; “Eſſe  
 “fatemur liberum arbitrium omnibus hominibus, ha-  
 “bens quidem iudicium rationis, non per quod ſit ido-  
 “neum in iis, quæ ad Deum pertinent, *ſine Deo aut*  
 “*inchoare aut certe peragere;*” contending, that free  
 will cannot either begin, or (*if it can begin*) *at leaſt not*  
*complete*, a good work. But while we admit, that the  
 ſuppoſed idea in theſe paſſages is not fully explained,  
 we may ſurely argue, that the tendency of them is too  
 obvious to eſcape obſervation. Although, however,  
 in a formulary of faith, Melancthon (the author of  
 both the preceding productions) might have thought it  
 neceſſary to avoid a complete declaration of his mean-  
 ing, yet he afterwards became explicit upon the point,  
 in a work expreſſly compoſed for public inſtruction,  
 the corrected edition of his *Loci Theologici*; a work,  
 generally eſteemed at the period under our conſidera-  
 tion, as of the greateſt authority among the Lutherans,  
 and one, as I have obſerved, of which Luther himſelf  
 ſpoke in terms of high commendation. In the chap-  
 ter *De Libero Arbitrio*, the doctrine of Synergism  
 in converſion (as ſuch a cooperation has uſually been  
 denominated) is thus openly avowed: “*De actio-*  
 “*nibus ſpiritualibus quæritur.* p. 89. *Sciendum eſt*  
 “*autem, Spiritum Sanctum efficacem eſſe per vocem*  
 “*Evangeliæ auditam ſeu cogitatam, ut Galat. iii. dici-*  
 “*tur, ‘Ut promiſſionem Spiritus accipiamus per fi-*  
 “*dem;’ ac sæpe dictum eſt, cogitantes de Deo opor-*  
 “*tere ordiri a verbo Dei, non quærere Deum ſine ſuo*  
 “*verbo. Cumque ordimur a verbo, hic concurrunt tres*  
 “*cauſæ bonæ actionis, verbum Dei, Spiritus Sanctus, et*  
 “*humana voluntas, aſſentiens nec repugnans verbo Dei.*  
 “*Poſſet enim excutere, ut excutit Saul ſua ſponte.*  
 “*Sed cum mens audiens ac ſuſtentans non repugnat,*  
 “non

“ non indulget diffidentiae, sed, *adjuvante* etiam Spiritu  
 “ Sancto, *conatur assentiri*, in hoc certamine *voluntas*  
 “ *non est otiosa*.

“ Veteres dixerunt, *præcedente gratia, comitante vo-*  
 “ *luntate*, bona opera fieri. Sic et Basilius inquit, *μόνον*  
 “ *θέλησον, καὶ Θεὸς προαπαντᾷ*, ‘ tantum velis, et Deus  
 “ *præoccurrit*.’ Deus antevertit nos, vocat, movet, ad-  
 “ *juvat, sed nos viderimus, ne repugnemus*. Constat  
 “ enim peccatum oriri a nobis non a voluntate Dei.  
 “ Chrysostomus inquit, *ὁ δὲ ἔλκων, τὸν βελοόμενον ἔλκει*.  
 “ Sicut et in illo ipso loco Joan. dicitur, ‘ Omnis qui  
 “ *audit a Patre et discit, veniet ad me*.’ Discere jubet;  
 “ id est, audire verbum, non repugnare, sed *assentiri*  
 “ *verbo Dei, non indulgere diffidentiae*.” p. 91, 92.  
 Such was the explication of this point, which he gave  
 in his last corrected edition of 1545. Fearing, how-  
 ever, that he might still be misunderstood, he after-  
 wards inserted the passage quoted in the preceding  
 note, and the following: “ Si tantum expectanda esset  
 “ illa infusio qualitatum, *sine ulla nostra actione, sicut*  
 “ *Entbusiastæ et Manichæi finxerunt*, nihil opus esset  
 “ ministerio Evangelico, nulla etiam lucta in animis  
 “ esset. Sed instituit Deus ministerium, ut vox acci-  
 “ piatur, ut promissionem mens cogitet et amplecta-  
 “ tur, et dum repugnamus diffidentiae, Spiritus Sanctus  
 “ *simul* in nobis sit efficax.

“ Sic igitur illis, qui *cessationem suam excusant*, qui  
 “ *putant nihil agere liberum arbitrium*, respondeo; imo  
 “ *mandatum Dei æternum et immotum est, ut voci*  
 “ *Evangelii obtemperes, ut Filium Dei audias, ut ag-*  
 “ *noscas Mediatorem*. Quam tetra sunt hæc peccata,  
 “ *nolle aspicere donatum generi humano Mediatorem Fi-*  
 “ *lium Dei? Non possum, inquires*. Imo *aliquo modo*  
 “ *potes*; et cum te voce Evangelii sustentas, adjuvari  
 “ te a Deo petito, et scito velle Deum hoc ipso modo

“ nos convertere, cum promissione excitati *luctamur*  
 “ *nobiscum, invocamus, et repugnamus diffidentiae nostrae,*  
 “ *et aliis vitiosis affectibus. Ideo veteres aliqui sic dixe-*  
 “ *runt, liberum arbitrium in homine facultatem esse appli-*  
 “ *candi se ad gratiam, id est, audit promissionem, et as-*  
 “ *sentiri conatur, et abjicit peccata contra conscientiam.*  
 “ Talia non fiunt in diabolis. Discrimen igitur inter  
 “ diabolos et genus humanum consideretur. Fiunt  
 “ autem hæc illustriora considerata promissione. Cum  
 “ promissio sit universalis, nec sint in Deo *contrariæ vo-*  
 “ *luntates,* necesse est, *in nobis esse aliquam discriminis*  
 “ *causam, cur Saul abjiciatur, David recipiatur,* id est,  
 “ necesse est, *aliquam esse actionem dissimilem in his duo-*  
 “ *bus.”* p. 93, 94. These quotations require no com-  
 ment. And that they are solely confined to the ac-  
 tion of the human will, while converting from evil,  
 and not while persevering in good, is manifest not  
 only from their general construction, but from that  
 which immediately follows: “ Præterea, *si de tota vita*  
 “ *piorum loquamur,* etsi est ingens imbecillitas, tamen  
 “ aliqua est libertas voluntatis, cum quidem *jam a Spi-*  
 “ *ritu Sancto adjuvetur, &c.”* That the doctrine of  
 Contingency was fully asserted in all the later editions  
 of this work, will be shewn in Serm. VII. note 15.

Extracts of a similar description might be easily ad-  
 duced from the other writings of Melancthon; but the  
 above perhaps may be sufficiently convincing. I shall  
 however add another from an Exposition of the Nicene  
 Creed, sent by Melancthon to Cranmer in the year  
 1550, which is expressed in terms too unequivocal to  
 be mistaken: “ Adversus Manichæos hæc fundamenta  
 “ tenenda sunt. . . . omnes homines *posse* converti ad  
 “ Deum, *nec voluntatem se habere pure passive, sed aliquo*  
 “ *modo active, ac assentiri posse Deo trahenti.”* Opera,  
 vol. i. p. 415.

To be persuaded that the sentiments of the Loci Theologici were those of the Lutheran Church at the time, it will be only necessary to read the following declaration of Melancthon himself upon this very subject, in answer to the calumnies of Flaccius, who had accused him of having corrupted the doctrine of Luther: “ Quod vero clamat Flaccius Illyricus, et doc-  
 “ trinam mutari, et restitui cærenomias quasdam aboli-  
 “ tas, primum de *doctrina* respondebo. Palam refutat  
 “ hanc calumniam vox *omnium* docentium in Eccle-  
 “ siis nostris, et in Scholis. Ac ne longa aut obscura  
 “ sit responsio, de universa doctrina sentio, quod scripsi  
 “ in eo libro, qui in multorum manibus est, titulo *Lo-*  
 “ *corum Theologorum*, in quo non volui novum doctri-  
 “ næ genus constituere, sed *fideliter* *collegi doctrinam*  
 “ *communem harum Ecclesiarum, quæ amplexæ sunt con-*  
 “ *fessionem exhibitam Imperatori anno 1530*, quam sen-  
 “ tentiam judico esse perpetuam Ecclesiæ Catholicæ  
 “ doctrinam, ac volo dextre, et sine sophistica, et sine  
 “ calumniis, intelligi id scriptum.

“ Et quantum mihi conscius sum, non studio dissen-  
 “ tiendi ab aliis, non amore novitatis, non φιλονεικία;  
 “ aut ulla alia prava cupiditate impulsus sum, ut illam  
 “ epitomen colligerem. Sed tempora occasionem præ-  
 “ buerunt. Cum *in prima inspectione Ecclesiarum*” (viz.  
 anno 1527.) “ comperissemus admodum *dissonos* clamo-  
 “ res esse ineruditorum de multis rebus, summam doc-  
 “ trinæ, quam Lutherus in diversis et interpretationum  
 “ et concionum voluminibus tradidit, tanquam in unum  
 “ corpus redactam edidi, et quæsi vi genus verborum,  
 “ quo ad proprietatem, quæ ad perspicuitatem et con-  
 “ cordiam utilis est, discentes assuefierent, *ac semper om-*  
 “ *nia scripta judicio Ecclesiæ nostræ et ipsius Lutheri per-*  
 “ *missi*; de multis quæstionibus etiam *diserte sciscitatus sum*  
 “ *Lutherum, quid sentiret, ac multi pagellarum istarum*  
 “ *exempla*

“*exempla adhuc habent.*” Epist. Lond. p. 134. Indeed so generally was this fact admitted at the exact æra, in which our Articles were composed, that when Osiander attempted to propagate a novel opinion upon Justification, all his colleagues opposed it upon the principle, that necessarily it could not be consistent with the doctrine of Luther, because contrary to that of Melancthon. “Andreas Osiander, quem in Prussia iam ivisse diximus, novum hoc tempore dogma proponit, . . . suæque sententiæ Lutherum etiam fuisse dicit. Reliqui vero theologi collegæ fortiter oppugnant, deque Luthero falsum esse dicunt, qui non ita multis mensibus ante mortem de libro Philippi Melancthonis, quo sacrae Scripturae Loci tractantur Communes, præclarum et amplum reliquisset in primi tomi præfatione testimonium. *Quum ergo Philippum invadat, Lutherum quoque sibi facere adversarium, quod idem ambo sentiant.*” Sleidani Comment. ann. 1551.

On the whole, therefore, it seems certain, that the Lutherans at every period maintained the resistibility of grace, and a cooperation of the mind with it, after a previous conversion of heart, in the production of genuine holiness; and that, when their Creed began to be settled, they admitted likewise a cooperation during the act of conversion itself; for such a tenet was avowedly embraced in a work, purposely drawn up to comprise an unsophisticated explication of their faith, by the author of their public Confession, and as such universally received and studied. It should be added, that, when our Articles were composed, the Loci Theologici still remained in the highest credit; and that, although the Lutherans at a much later æra chose to reject its authority, upon the very topic under consideration, and revert to the idea of a pure

pure passivity in conversion ; to the idea, that the human will, although not inactive, contributed nothing towards the formation of the act itself ; yet their very rejection of it satisfactorily proved the nature of that doctrine, which they conceived it to inculcate. Let it not however be supposed, that because they denied, in a very important point of view, the agency of the human will, they on that account were disposed to patronise the Calvinistical system of Predestination. On the contrary, they beheld it with abhorrence ; nor did they scruple to express their disapprobation of it in language, which a modern Arminian would scarcely adopt, or a modern Calvinist endure.

Page 91, note (<sup>15</sup>).

Deinde, ut palam fiat quam longe aberraverint a veritate cœci isti et cœcorum duces, et quam ista sua impia et blasphema doctrina *non solum obscuraverint, sed simpliciter sustulerint Evangelium et Christum obruerint*. Si enim ego existens in peccato mortali possum facere aliquod opusculum, quod non solum secundum substantiam sit gratum Deo, sed etiam possit mereri gratiam de congruo, et ubi habuero gratiam, possum facere opera secundum gratiam, id est, delectionem, et acquirere de jure æternam vitam, *quid jam opus est mihi gratia Dei, remissione peccatorum, promissione morte et victoria Christi? Christus jam plane mihi otiosus est* ; habeo enim liberum arbitrium, et vires faciendi bonum opus, per quod gratiam mereor de congruo, et postea æternam vitam de condigno, . . . . Quare cum Paulo in toto negamus meritum congrui et condigni, et certa fiducia pronunciamus, istas speculationes esse mera ludibria Sathanæ, *nunquam facta aut exemplis ostensa*. Nemini enim unquam dedit Deus gratiam et vitam æternam pro merito congrui et condigni. Sunt ergo illæ disputationes Scholasticorum de merito congrui et condigni

*tantum*

*tantum inania figmenta et speculabilia hominum otiosorum somnia de rebus nibili. Super quæ tamen universus papatus fundatus est, et adhuc hodie his nititur. Opera Lutheri, vol. v. p. 307. Ea enim inanißima somnia homines securi, qui nullis unquam tentationibus, et veris pavoribus peccati et mortis exercitati sunt, e suo capite finxerunt. Ideo non intelligunt quid loquuntur, aut de quibus affirmant. Deinde nullum exemplum operis ante gratiam et post gratiam potest dari. Sunt igitur nugacissimæ fabulæ, quibus Papistæ seipsos et alios deludunt. Ibid. " Ut maxime sim peccator, nihil tam*  
*" men periculi est; facile huic malo remedium inve-*  
*" niam, si fecero hoc aut istud opus in Dei gloriam, si*  
*" tot Missas celebravero, aut audiero, si a carnibus ali-*  
*" quot diebus abstinuero, si pensum precularum mea-*  
*" rum absolvero, &c. Hæc opera mea Deus respiciet,*  
*" et propter ea peccata remittet."*

Sed longe secus se res habet, O miser. . . . Etenim, si nos viribus humanis peccata expiare, et mortem abolere, possemus, *nihil fuisset necesse Christum fieri hominem, baptizari, et mori propter peccata nostra.* Id. vol. vii. p. 375.



---

# NOTES

## ON SERMON V.

*Page 97, note (1).*

WHEN the Lutherans withheld from the Heathen world the security derivable from a participation of the Christian Covenant, they never meant to withhold from it (as I have previously remarked in the case of infants) a claim to the uncovenanted mercies of God. They excluded it from the certainty, but not the probability, of salvation. Aurifaber in his "Colloquia," quia, oder Lischreden, D. Mart. Lutheri," states, that Luther expressed himself upon the point in the following unequivocal language, thus translated from the German: "Cicero, a wise and good man, suffered and performed much. I hope, said Luther, God will be merciful unto him, and to such as he was. Howsoever it is not our duty to speak *certainly* touching that point, (Wiewol uns nicht geburet dafs *gewis* zu sagen, noch zu *definiren und schliessen*,) but to remain by the word revealed unto us, namely, 'whoever believeth and is baptized, the same shall be saved.' Yet, nevertheless, God is able *to dispense*, and *to hold a difference* among the nations and the Heathens; but our duty is not to know nor to search after time and measure. For there will be a new heaven and a new earth, much larger and more broad than now they be: God can give to every

" one

“one according to his pleasure.” *Colloquia Mensalia* of Luther, translated by Capt. H. Bell, ed. 1652. p. 509. Luther therefore seems both to have hoped and believed, that God would be merciful to the Heathen world; but, as nothing had been clearly revealed upon the subject, he thought it not his duty to speak positively upon it.

Page 97, note (<sup>2</sup>).

The sentiments of Zuingli upon this interesting topic may be collected from the extracts already given in note 17. Serm. III. His works indeed abound in passages tending to prove, that the virtuous heathen, who fulfils the law of God written in his heart, is equally to be enumerated among the elect, as the virtuous Christian: “*Nihil enim vetat, quo minus inter gentes quoque Deus sibi deligat, qui sese reverentur, qui observent, et post fata illi jungantur. Libera est enim electio ejus. Ego certe malim, si optio detur, Socratis aut Senecæ sortem eligere, qui, ut numen unum agnoverunt, ita mentis puritate faterentur illud demereri, quam aut Pontificis Romani, qui tamen se Deum vel ipse indicaret, si licitator adfuit, aut cujusquam regis, imperatoris ac principis, qui hunc fculnum Deum tuetur. Illi enim, ut religionem ad verbum, et quod ad Sacramenta pertinet, non agnoverint, attamen quod ad rem ipsam aio religiosiores ac sanctiores fuisse, quam omnes unquam Dominicastro et Franciscani.*” *Opera Zuinglii*, vol. ii. p. 371. “*Ista in hunc usum argumentati sumus, ut ostenderemus toto errare cœlo, etiam si sint non modica magna, sed vetera quoque nomina, qui damnationi æternæ solent adjudicare nunc Christianorum infantes, cum non sint baptismo tincti, nunc vero eos omnes, quos Gentiles vocamus. Quid enim scimus, quid fidei quisque in corde suo Dei manu scriptum teneat? Senecæ*  
“*viri*

“ *viri sanctissimi fidem*, quam epistola ad Lucilium 34.  
 “ prodiit, quis non admiretur? Cum ait, ‘ Sic certe  
 “ vivendum est, tanquam aliquis in pectus intimum  
 “ prospicere possit, et potest. Quid enim prodest ab  
 “ homine aliquid esse secretum? Nihil Deo clausum  
 “ est. Interest animis nostris, et cogitationibus mediis  
 “ intervenit. Sic intervenit dico non tanquam ali-  
 “ quando discedat.’ Hæc Seneca. Quis quæso hanc  
 “ *fidem* in cor hominis hujus scripsit? Neque quis-  
 “ quam putet ista in *evacuationem Christi tendere*, ut  
 “ quidam nos insimulant; *amplificant enim illius glo-*  
 “ *riam. Per Christum enim accedere oportet*, quicumque  
 “ ad Deum veniunt, de qua re paulo post. Unde *soce-*  
 “ *rum Moſis* ne suspicamur quidem alia via, quam quæ  
 “ dicit, ‘ Ego sum via, veritas, et vita,’ *ad Deum per-*  
 “ *venisse*, qua et *Moſes et omnes veniunt*. Hoc enim  
 “ qui non crediderit, condemnabitur,’ nullatenus est  
 “ *absolute* intelligendum, sed de his, qui, *audito Evan-*  
 “ *gelio, credere noluerunt*. . . . Non ergo imputetur ig-  
 “ noratio his, ad quos nemo venit, ut mysterium  
 “ Christi prædicet; *Domino ſtant et cadunt*.” Ibid. p.  
 118. “ Credimus ergo, animos fidelium protinus, ut  
 “ ex corporibus evaſerint, subvolare cœlo, numini con-  
 “ jungi, æternoque gaudere. Hic tibi ſperandum est,  
 “ O piiffime Rex, ſi modo inſtar Davidis, Ezechix, et  
 “ Joſix rerum ſummam a Deo tibi creditam modera-  
 “ tus fueris, viſurum eſſe primum numen ipſum in ſua  
 “ ſubſtantia, in ſua ſpecie, cumque univerſis dotibus  
 “ opibusque illius, fruiturumque his omnibus non par-  
 “ ce, ſed ad ſatietatem, non ad ſaſtidium, quod ferme  
 “ comitatur ſaturitatem, ſed ad jucundam impletionem.  
 “ . . . Deinde ſperandum eſt tibi viſurum eſſe ſancto-  
 “ rum, prudentium, fidelium, conſtantium, fortium,  
 “ virtuoſorum omnium, quicumque a condito mundo  
 “ fuerunt, ſodalitatem, cœtum, et contubernium. Hic  
 “ *duos*

“ duos Adam, redemptum ac redemptorem; hic Abelum,  
 “ Enochium, Noam, Abrahamum, Isaacum, Judam,  
 “ Mosen, Josuam, Gideonem, Samuelem, Heliam, He-  
 “ liseum, Isaiam, ac deiparam Virginem, de qua ille  
 “ præcinuit, Davidem, Ezekiam, Josiam, Baptistam,  
 “ Petrum, Paulum: *hic Herculem, Thesæum, Socratem,*  
 “ *Aristidem, Antigonum, Numam, Camillum, Catones,*  
 “ *Scipiones*; hic antecessores tuos, et quotquot *in fide*  
 “ hinc migrarunt, majores tuos videbis. Et summa-  
 “ tim non fuit vir bonus, non erit mens sancta, non fi-  
 “ delis anima, ab ipso mundi exordio usque ad ejus con-  
 “ summationem, quem non sis isthic cum Deo visurus.  
 “ Quo spectaculo quid lætius, quid amœnius, quid de-  
 “ nique honorificentius vel cogitare poterit?” Ibid.  
 p. 559.

The principles, upon which he grounded his posi-  
 tion, were these; that as Christ died for all men, and  
 as God is no respecter of persons, all are elected, whe-  
 ther Christians or Heathens, who possess faith or ge-  
 nuine piety; that is, who truly love and fear God;  
 “ signum enim electionis est Deum amare et timere.  
 “ In adultis ergo sic requiritur fides.” Opera, vol. i.  
 p. 383. Accordingly therefore, he thus laid down the  
 rule of election, although not the cause of it, which  
 he in every instance attributed to the free and uncon-  
 ditional will of the Almighty: “ *Non est personarum re-*  
 “ *spectus apud Deum*) per Anthypophoram Gentibus  
 “ occurrit, quæ se excusabant, nec damnatos existima-  
 “ bant. Et in hoc judicio, inquit Paulus, nemo excipi-  
 “ tur: quicumque bonum ex fide operatus est, recipiet  
 “ præmium; qui malum ex incredulitate, is recipiet  
 “ pœnam. *Nihil agit Deus odio aut favore, nihil ex affec-*  
 “ *tibus; nam hujusmodi in Deum non cadunt.*” In Rom.  
 cap. 2: Opera, vol. iii. p. 411.

The doctrine of Zuingle upon this head, as P. Si-  
 mon

mon remarks, in his observations upon the Commentaries of Conrad Pellican, was embraced by all his immediate followers: "En un mot, Pellican avec toute l'école Zuinglienne d'alors a établi *des graces générales de la bonté de Dieu à l'égard de toutes les nations.*" *Bibliothèque Critique*, vol. iii. p. 298.

It is evident then, that when the Zuinglians represented congruous works as sinful, because not proceeding from faith, they considered not Heathen piety as of that description, but, like our own, as acceptable to God through the merits of Christ. In this sense Bullinger seems to have particularly alluded to the subject: "Deinde interrogatur, 'An opera quæ faciunt Gentiles, ac speciem habent probitatis vel virtutis, *peccata sint*, an *bona opera.*' Certum est *Deum et inter Gentiles habuisse suos electos.* Si qui tales fuerunt, non caruerunt *Spiritu Sancto et fide.* Idcirco opera ipsorum *facta ex fide bona fuerunt, non peccata.*" *Sermonum Decades quinque*, p. 174. In condemning congruous works, they solely condemned that merit of human virtue, which the Papists inculcated, as in itself entitled to divine acceptance, without the mercy of God, and the atonement of Christ: "Ergo si qui ex Gentibus sunt salvati, non per opera naturæ aut merita propria sunt salvati, sed *per misericordiam Dei in Christo Domino nostro.* Neque vero lex naturæ insita est hominibus a Deo, ut salvet homines *sine gratia et Christo*, sed magis ut doceat quid bonum sit, quid malum, ut evincat nos esse peccatores, et inexcusabiles coram Domino." *Ibid.* p. 38. Of the same opinion with Zuingle, or at least with Luther, upon the point of Heathen salvation, was Erasmus; who was patronised by Cranmer, and beloved by Latimer, (*Camerarii Vita Melanct.* p. 340.) and of whose labours, even to the last, our Reformers were not unmindful; see the

Injunctions

Injunctions of Edward and Elizabeth in Sparrow's Collection. "Ubi nunc agat anima Ciceronis fortasse non est humani iudicii pronuntiare. Me certe non admodum adversum habituri sint in ferendis calculis, *qui sperant illum apud superos quietam vitam agere.* . . . . Verum hac de re liberum esto suum cuique iudicium." Preface to the Tusculan Disputations.

Page 97, note (3).

"Oblatio Christi, semel facta, *perfecta* est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis *totius mundi* tam originalibus quam actualibus." Art. 31. This part of our Article (as I have observed in note 12. Sermon II.) was in a great measure taken from the following in the Augsbourg Confession, "Passio Christi fuit oblatio et satisfactio non solum pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis peccatis." Art. de Missa. In their imitation of this passage, our Reformers, we perceive, introduced an idea, not to be found in the Confession, asserting the oblation of Christ to have been not only a satisfaction as well for actual as original sins, but a *perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the actual and original sins of the whole world.* To what can we more properly attribute their introduction of such an idea, than to their predilection for the universality of Christ's sacrifice in the Zuinglian sense? Bullinger in his Decades of Sermons published in 1550, and dedicated to Edward VI. thus expresses himself upon the same subject. "Itaque relinquitur jam indubitatum Christum Dominum *plenariam* esse propitiationem, satisfactionem, hostiamque, ac victimam pro peccatis (pro pœna, inquam, et pro culpa) *totius mundi*, et quidem solam. Non est enim in alio quoquam salus. Nec enim aliud nomen est datum inter homines, in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri." p. 17. Our Reformers indeed might not have had this particular

lar quotation in their eye ; it is nevertheless certain, that they adopted a similar mode of expression, most probably with a similar intention.

It should likewise be remarked, that in our Communion service, language precisely the same was inserted in that part of the prayer of Consecration, which was originally composed at the time, at least, which is neither to be found in the Canon of the Mass, nor the form of Cologne : “ Who made there, by his one oblation of himself, once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, *for the sins of the whole world.*”

It must indeed be confessed, that the words under consideration, although they clearly admit, do not *necessarily* imply, the sense alluded to ; at least that they might have been chiefly directed to another object. The following extracts however from the writings of Cranmer sufficiently evince, that the principal compiler of our Articles and Liturgy maintained an opinion upon the subject, which it seems still more difficult to distinguish from that of Zuingli. “ This is the honour and glory of our high Priest, wherein he admitteth neither partner nor successor. For by his own oblation *he satisfied the Father for all men’s sins, and reconciled mankind into his grace and favour. . . .* And as he dying once was offered for all, so, *as much as pertained to him, he took all men’s sins unto himself.*” Answer to Gardiner, p. 372. “ What ought to be more certain and known to all Christian people, than that Christ dyed once, and but once, *for the redemption of the world ?*” Ibid. p. 393. “ For Almighty God, without respect of persons, accepteth the oblation and sacrifice of priest and lay-person, of king and subject, of man and woman, of young and old, yea, of English, French, Scot, Greek, Latin,

“tin, Jew, and *Gentile*, of every man, according to  
 “his faithful and obedient heart unto him, and that  
 “*through the sacrifice propitiatory of Jesus Christ.*” De-  
 fence of the True Doctrine of the Sacrament, p. 114.

But liberal as appears to have been the opinion of our Reformers upon this point, some have erroneously conceived, that our 18th Article is directly levelled against it. “Sunt et illi anathematizandi, qui dicere  
 “audent, unumquemque *in lege aut secta, quam profi-*  
 “*tetur*, esse servandum, modo juxta illam et lumen na-  
 “turæ accurate vixerit, cum sacræ literæ tantum Jesu  
 “Christi nomen prædicent, in quo salvos fieri homines  
 “oporteat.” This Article, we observe, immediately precedes one upon the *visible* Church of Christ; a circumstance, which will be found in some degree to elucidate its real object. For among the many singularities of the day, one too important to be overlooked seems to have been that of esteeming *the profession of Christianity* a thing indifferent; of being persuaded, that we shall be equally entitled to salvation, whether we conform ourselves to the law of Christ, of Moses, or of Mahomet. Against such a conceit therefore, and such alone, is the Article framed, which, in language unusually strong, anathematizes those, who presume to say, (evidently alluding to a bold opinion of the times; “*Horribilis est et inanis illorum audacia,*” is the paraphrase of the Reform. Legum Eccles.) that every man will be saved by carefully regulating his life according to that law or sect, which he chooses to *profess*, and that, therefore, we are not under the necessity, according to the title of the Article, “of *hop-*  
 “*ing* for eternal salvation only in the *name* of Christ” (“*De speranda æterna salute tantum in nomine Chris-*  
 “*ti*”). By the following quotations from Melancthon it will be seen, that these free-thinkers main-  
 tained



tained the due observation of that peculiar law, or rule of action, which we may embrace, to be the sole principle of merit in the eye of heaven: “*Ufitata et falsa distinctio est, tres esse leges, naturalem, Mosaicam, et Evangelicam. Et magis impium est, quod affingunt, singulos propter suæ legis observationem consecutos esse remissionem peccatorum, et vitam æternam. Una enim lex moralis est omnium ætatum, donec manet natura hominis. Estque lex aliquo modo naturaliter nota. Est et unum Evangelium.*” Opera Lutheri, vol. i. p. 413. Melanct. Disput. “*Non est igitur imaginandum, patres lege naturæ salvatos esse, Judæos lege Moyfi, nos salvari nostra quadam lege. Imo una lex est moralis omnium ætatum, omnium gentium, ut supra diximus; sed nec patres, nec Judæos, nec Gentes, nec nos ideo salvamur, quia legi satisfacimus.*” Loci Theologici, de promissione Evangelii, p. 208. That Zuingle himself would not have scrupled to subscribe to our own Article, we may without hesitation assert, because in the year 1529 he subscribed to one upon a similar, if not the same, subject, apparently stronger. “*Credimus,*” said the fifth Article signed in the Conference at Marpurg, “*quod ita liberamur ab hoc et ab omnibus peccatis, et morte æterna, si nostram fiduciam collocemus in Filium Dei Jesum Christum, pro nobis mortuum; et quod extra hanc fidem per nullum opus, aut certæ vitæ genus, liberari possimus ab ullo peccato.*” Vita Zuinglii, Melchior. Adam. p. 32.

Page 98, note (\*).

“Thus we have heard how evil we be *of ourselves*, how *of ourselves, and by ourselves*, we have no goodness, help, nor salvation, but contrariwise, sin, damnation, and death everlasting; which if we deeply weigh and consider, we shall the better understand

“ the great mercy of God, and *how our salvation cometh only by Christ.*” Homily of the misery of *all mankind*, and of his condemnation to death everlasting by his own sin, 2d part. The object of this Homily is to prove the necessity of redemption from the depravity of our nature since the fall of Adam, and the consequent imperfection of our virtues ; circumstances, demonstrating our incapacity to redeem ourselves, by our own efforts, from sin and misery. Hence, after pointing out our inability “ to stand before the righteous judgment of God” on the score of human merit; it adds ; “ To God therefore must we fly, or else we shall never find peace, rest, and quietness of conscience in our hearts. For he is the Father of mercies, and God of all consolation. He is the Lord, with whom is plenteous redemption; he is the God, which of his own mercy saveth us, and setteth out his charity and exceeding love towards us, in that of his own voluntary goodness, when we were perishing, he saved us, and provided an everlasting kingdom for us. And all these heavenly treasures are given us, not for our own deserts, merits, or good deeds, (which of *ourselves* we have none,) but of his own mercy freely. . . . Now how these exceeding great mercies of God, set abroad in Christ Jesu for us, be obtained, and how we be delivered from the captivity of sin, death, and hell, it shall more at large (with God’s help) be declared in the next Sermon.” The next Homily is entitled, “ A Sermon of the salvation of *mankind*, by only Christ our Saviour, from sin and death everlasting.”

Page 99, note (5).

“ *Ea est hominis post lapsum Adæ conditio, ut sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare non possit.*” 1st

Part

Part of the 10th Article. This (as I have noticed in note 15. Sermon II.) was manifestly taken from the following passage in the Wirtemberg Confession: "*Quod autem nonnulli affirmant, homini post lapsum tantam animi integritatem relictam, ut possit sese naturalibus suis viribus, et bonis operibus, ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare, haud obscure pugnat cum Apostolica doctrina, et cum vero Ecclesiæ Catholicæ consensu.*" Art. de Peccato. When the terms of the Lutheran statement are considered, as well as the description of that assembly, for a public exhibition in which it was composed, no doubt perhaps will be entertained respecting the tendency of it. The "nonnulli" alluded to were clearly the Scholastics, and their disciples, who, of course, might have been expected to be sufficiently numerous in a Popish Council.

Page 99, note (6).

"Absque gratia Dei (quæ per Christum est) nos præveniente ut velimus, et cooperante dum volumus, ad pietatis opera facienda, quæ Deo grata sunt et accepta, nihil valeamus." 2d Part of our 10th Article. The passage of St. Austin, which our Reformers kept in view, was the following: "*Sine illo vel operante ut velimus, vel cooperante cum volumus, ad bona pietatis opera nihil valeamus.*" De Gratia et libero Arbitrio, cap. 17. The additions, "quæ per Christum est," and "quæ Deo grata sunt et accepta," were made to narrow the question; and assert the single point of human inefficiency to merit congruously. That the object of this Article is that which has been pointed out, appears likewise from the "*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.*" (Sermon III. note 14.) in which it is thus alluded to: "*Et similiter nobis contra illos progredientes, qui tantum in libero arbitrio roboris et ner-*

“vorum ponunt, ut eo solo, sine aliqua speciali Christi gratia, recte ab hominibus vivi posse constituent;” the precise idea, upon which the Scholastics grounded their position of Congruous Merit.

Page 101, note (7).

According to the doctrine of the Papists, prayer, without any real devotion of heart, was deemed in itself meritorious, *ex opere operato*, of God's favours. Hence the Lutherans, on the other hand, always united faith and invocation, considering the latter as ineffectual without the former. “Jam qui scit, se per Christum habere propitium patrem, is vere novit Deum, scit se ei curæ esse, *invocare Deum*. Denique non est sine Deo, sicut Gentes. . . . *Sine fide nullo modo potest humana natura primi aut secundi præcepti opera facere. Sine fide non invocat Deum.*” Augsbourg Confess. ed. 1530. Since therefore we cannot thus turn and prepare ourselves by our natural strength and good works, contemplated according to their own sufficiency, to true faith and invocation, these, they argued, must be regarded as the gifts of God through Christianity.

Page 102, note (8).

The word *grace* was applied in various senses by the Scholastics; yet, when put absolutely, was generally understood to be what they termed *gratia gratum faciens*, the efficacious principle of condign merit. Thus works of congruity were said to be performed before and without grace. See Durandus A. Sanct. Porc. In Lib. Sentent. lib. i. distinct. 16. quæst. 2. The same expression however was sometimes more largely used, for a species of general influx, (according to the Scholastical phrase,) of which all men participated. To this Melancthon seems to refer in an account of the public dispute between Carlostadius and Eccius, in the

the year 1519. "Neque jam disputo; 'Accedat peculiarare auxilium, necne;' variant enim et ipsi questionum magistri. *Certe magno consensu Scholæ id peculiarare auxilium gratiam Jesu Christi esse non permitunt.*" Epist. Lond. p. 129. Hence we perceive a principal reason, why, to the terms "*gratia Dei*," our Reformers subjoined "*quæ per Christum est.*"

Page 102, note (9).

".... A true and lively faith, which nevertheless is the gift of God, and not man's *only* work without God." Homily of Salvation, 1st part.

Page 103, note (10).

For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we, which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not *prevent* them which are asleep.

For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first.

Then we, which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds. 1 Thes. iv. 15, 16, 17.

Page 105, note (11).

Why, on this occasion, the participle *præveniens* was substituted for that of *operans*, and a more definite conjunction for one less so, will more readily appear, if we review the whole passage, as it stands in St. Austin: "Et quis istam etsi parvam dare *cœperat* caritatem, nisi ille, qui *præparat* voluntatem, et cooperando perficit, quod operando *incipit*? Quoniam ipse, ut velimus, operatur *incipiens*, qui volentibus cooperatur perficiens. Propter quod Apostolus, 'Certus sum, quoniam, qui operatur in nobis opus bonum, perficiet usque ad diem Christi Jesu.' Ut ergo velimus sine nobis operatur, cum autem volumus et sic

“ volumus, ut faciamus nobiscum cooperatur, tamen  
 “ fine illo vel operante ut velimus, vel cooperante cum  
 “ volumus, ad bona pietatis opéra nihil valemus.” De  
 Gratia, &c. In this quotation, the words “ ut velimus,  
 “ fine nobis operatur,” were usually considered as denoting only an operation in *preparing* the mind to will; those which follow, “ cum autem volumus et  
 “ sic volumus, ut faciamus, nobiscum cooperatur,” a cooperation in *determining* its will to action. It must however be acknowledged, that they seem equivocal. Calvin therefore had so interpreted them, as to make them speak a language applicable only to divine, and inimical to all human, agency. But such an interpretation the compiler of our Article appears to have disapproved. And were a modern Arminian so to remodel the passage as to render it strictly conformable with his own sentiments, could he more effectually accomplish his purpose, than in the mode, which actually was pursued, by omitting the previous part of the definition altogether, changing *operans* into *præveniens*, and *cum* into *dum*?

Thus a well known extract from the writings of St. Austin was selected, because, with the addition of the sentence, “ quæ Deo grata sunt et accepta,” it directly militated against the Scholastical position of Congruous Merit; a position, which it was the principal object of the Article to oppose: but, as certain expressions, in which it was couched, might at least seem, upon a collateral and inferior point, to convey a meaning, which it was not wished to inculcate, those were either omitted, or corrected so as to prevent all ambiguity.

I have remarked, that the Latin copy of our Articles ought to be consulted in cases of doubt and controversy. In Latin they were originally composed;  
 nor

nor were they ever subscribed in English, until the Convocation of the year 1571. Previously therefore to that year, the English editions materially varied; while the Latin (the errors of the presses alone excepted) remained the same, unless where alterations were introduced by authority.

But it should be added, that in the English copy, constantly used since the period referred to, the expression is at least inaccurate. It is there said, “with-  
“out the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that  
“we may have a good will, and working with us,  
“*when we have that good will.*” Certainly the words, *when we have that good will*, are not a correct translation of *dum volumus*. Nor is the precise grammatical sense of them very clear. The verb *have*, used actively, and not as an auxiliary, sometimes appears to mean rather the act of acquisition, than that of complete possession; as Matthew xix. 16. “Good Master, what  
“good thing shall I do, that I may *have* eternal life?” and in other similar passages of the Bible. Indeed to this exact sense perhaps it is appropriated in the first part of the clause before us, in which it is said, “pre-  
“venting us, that we may *have*” (that is, *obtain*) “a  
“good will.” If therefore in the latter part of the clause it be applied in the same way, the construction may be, cooperating with us, “when” (or *at the period in which*) “we have” (or *are having, obtain, or are obtaining*) “that good will.” Thus is the same verb used in the same incomplete present tense, when our Saviour addresses the disciples on their way to Emmaus: “What manner of communications are  
“these, that ye *have*” (or *are having*) “one to ano-  
“ther, as ye walk, and are sad?” Luke xxiv. 17. Had the phraseology been, “preventing us, that we may  
“*will* what is good, and working with us, *when we*  
“*will*

“*will* that good,” little or no obscurity would have occurred. It must however be confessed, that at first view the words, “when we have,” seem to admit a very different interpretation, and to signify, not *when we are obtaining*, but *after that we have obtained*; yet as this interpretation is irreconcilable with the evident meaning of the Latin, surely we ought not to explain a translation in a sense directly repugnant to the original; or, if it must be so explained, at least should consider it rather as an error of the translator, than the sentiment of the compiler.

By way of contrast with the doctrine of our Church in this part of the Article, I shall subjoin that of Calvin upon the same question. “Sinistre,” he remarks, “non minus quam infelicitè tritam illam distinctionem usurpant operantis gratiæ et cooperantis. Hæc quidem usus est Augustinus, sed commoda definitione leniens, Deum cooperando perficere, quod operando incipit; ac eandem esse gratiam, sed fortiri nomen pro diverso modo effectus. Unde sequitur eum non partiri *inter Deum et nos*, ac si *ex proprio utriusque motu esset mutua concurrentia*; sed *gratiæ multiplicationem notare*. . . . Ad id, quod dicere solent, postquam primæ gratiæ locum dedimus, jam conatus nostros subsequenti gratiæ cooperari, respondeo. Si intelligant nos, ex quo semel domini virtute in justitiæ obsequium edomiti sumus, *ultro* pergere, et *propensos esse* ad sequendam gratiæ actionem, nihil recuso. Est enim certissimum, ubi gratia Dei regnat, talem esse obsequendi promptitudinem. Unde id tamen nisi quod Spiritus Dei *ubique sibi consentiens*, quam principio generavit obedientiæ affectionem, ad perseverandi constantiam fovet et confirmat? At si hominem *a seipso* sumere volunt, unde gratiæ Dei collaboret, *pestilentissime hallucinantur*.” Institut. lib.



lib. ii. cap. 3. sect. 11. Here he plainly admits no cooperation, except that of grace cooperating with itself; "*Spiritus Dei ubique sibi consentiens.*" And hence was he always careful to distinguish his own tenet from that of the Schools, which he thus censures: "Id dum vult expedire magister Sententiarum *dupli-*  
*cem* gratiam necessariam esse nobis docet, quo reddamur ad bonum opus idonei. Alteram vocat *operan-*  
*tem*, qua fit ut *efficaciter* velimus bonum: *cooperan-*  
*tem* alteram, quæ bonam voluntatem *sequitur adju-*  
*vando.* In qua partitione hoc mihi displicet, quod, dum gratiæ Dei tribuit efficacem boni appetitum; innuit hominem jam *suapte natura* bonum quodammodo, licet *inefficaciter* appetere; sicut Bernardus bonam quidem voluntatem opus Dei esse asserens, homini tamen hoc concedit, ut *motu proprio* bonam ejusmodi voluntatem appetat. Sed istud ab Augustini mente procul abest, a quo tamen sumpsisse partitionem videri vult Lombardus. In secundo membro ambiguitas me offendit, quæ perversam genuit interpretationem. Ideo enim putarunt nos secundæ Dei gratiæ *cooperari*, quod *nostri juris* sit *primam gratiam vel respuendo irritam facere, vel obedi-*  
*ter sequendo confirmare.* . . . . Hæc duo notare obiter libuit, ut videas jam lector, quantum a *sanioribus* Scholasticis dissentiam. *Longiore enim intervallo a recentioribus sophistis differo*, quanto scilicet a vetustate longius abscesserunt." Ibid. lib. ii. cap. 2. sect. 6. Nor while he warmly contended for the truth of his opinion, did he wish to conceal its novelty: "Ac voluntatem movet, non qualiter *multis seculis traditum est et creditum*, ut nostræ postea sit electionis motioni aut obtemperare aut refragari, sed illam efficaciter afficiendo. Illud ergo toties a Chrysostomo repeti-

tum

“tum repudiari necesse est, ‘Quem trahit volentem  
 ‘trahit;’ quo insinuat Dominum porrecta tantum ma-  
 “nu expectare, an suo auxilio juvari nobis adlubef-  
 “cat.” Ibid. lib. ii. cap. 3. sect. 10. Indeed, he  
 frankly confesses, that, in support of his position upon  
 free will in general, he cannot appeal to the autho-  
 rity of the Fathers, that of St. Austin alone excepted,  
 whom, of course, he explains in his own way. He  
 states them to have been ambiguous: he might have  
 allowed, that they were completely hostile to his sys-  
 tem: “Quod si nos patrum auctoritas movet, illi qui-  
 “dem *assidue* in ore habent vocabulum” (viz. liberum  
 arbitrium). Ibid. lib. ii. cap. 2. sect. 8. “Magnum  
 “mihi præjudicium attulisse forsitan videar, qui Scrip-  
 “tores omnes ecclesiasticos, excepto Augustino, ita  
 “ambigue aut varie in hac re locutos esse confessus  
 “sum, ut *certum* quippiam ex eorum scriptis haberi  
 “nequeat. Hoc enim perinde nonnulli interpreta-  
 “buntur, quasi a suffragii jure depellere ideo ipsos vo-  
 “luerim, *quia mihi sint omnes adversarii*. Ego vero  
 “nihil aliud spectavi, quam quod volui simpliciter ac  
 “bona fide consultum piis ingeniis; quæ si eorum  
 “sententiam hac in parte expectent, semper *incerta*  
 “fluctuabunt; adeo nunc hominem liberi arbitrii vi-  
 “ribus spoliatum ad solam gratiam confugere docent;  
 “nunc *propriis ipsum armis aut instruunt, aut videntur*  
 “*instruere*.” Ibid. sect. 9.

Page 107, note (12).

O God, who declarest thy almighty power most chiefly in shewing mercy and pity, mercifully grant unto us such a measure of thy grace, that we, running the way of thy commandments, may obtain thy gracious promises, and be made partakers of thy heavenly treasures. Collect. 11th Sunday after Trinity.

Page

*Page 108, note (13).*

Concil. Trident. Decret. de Justificatione, Sessio sexta, Canon 7.

It may perhaps be proper to observe, that in the passage which follows, it is by no means intended obliquely to charge upon the Calvinistical doctrine of Inspiration, as appropriated to the elect, when correctly understood, the absurdities and impieties, which enthusiasm has sometimes deduced from it. Calvin himself was both a wise and a good man; inferior to none of his contemporaries in general ability, and superior to almost all in the art, as well as elegance, of composition, in the perspicuity and arrangement of his ideas, the structure of his periods, and the Latinity of his diction. Although attached to a theory, which he found it difficult in the extreme to free from the suspicion of blasphemy against God, as the author of sin, he certainly was no blasphemer; but, on the contrary, adopted that very theory, from an anxiety, not to commit, but (as he conceived) to avoid blasphemy, that of ascribing to human, what he deemed alone imputable to divine, agency. With respect to the application of it, at a later period, to enthusiastical purposes, no one would have more severely reprehended such an application, than he himself; nor ought we perhaps to attribute the principles, which modern enthusiasts have extracted from it, to Calvin, more than we do those, which modern republicans have affected to derive from a political revolution in this country, to the authors of that event. That the Calvinistical system, however, has a tendency to promote enthusiasm, its more rational advocates will scarcely deny; or, although they may argue, that it has not a necessary tendency this way, surely they will admit, that it is extremely liable to be thus abused, and that  
such

such is the effect which it usually produces in minds, where judgment holds not the reins of passion, and imagination breaks loose from the restraints of reason; unfortunately the case of mankind in general.

Page 111, note (<sup>14</sup>).

See Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, Append. p. 60.

Page 112, note (<sup>15</sup>).

“ Let us all confess with mouth and heart that we  
 “ be full of *imperfections* : Let us know our own works,  
 “ of what *imperfection* they be, and then we shall not  
 “ stand foolishly and arrogantly in our own conceits,  
 “ nor challenge any part of justification by our merits  
 “ or works. For truly there be *imperfections* in our  
 “ best works. We do not love God so much as we  
 “ are bound to do, with all our heart, mind, and  
 “ power; we do not fear God so much as we ought  
 “ to do; we do not pray to God, but with great and  
 “ many *imperfections*; we give, forgive, believe, live,  
 “ and hope *imperfectly*; we speak, think, and do *im-*  
 “ *perfectly*; we fight against the devil, the world, and  
 “ the flesh, *imperfectly*; *let us therefore not be ashamed*  
 “ *to confess plainly our state of imperfection*; yea let us  
 “ not be ashamed to confess *imperfection* even in all  
 “ our best works. Let none of us be ashamed to say  
 “ with holy St. Peter, ‘ I am a *sinful* man.’ Let us  
 “ say with the holy prophet David, ‘ We have *sinned*  
 “ with our fathers, we have done amiss, and dealt  
 “ wickedly.’ Let us all make open confession with  
 “ the prodigal son to our Father, and say unto him,  
 “ We have *sinned* against heaven, and before thee, (O  
 “ father,) we are not worthy to be called thy sons,  
 “ &c. &c. . . . In ourselves therefore may we not glo-  
 “ ry, which (of ourselves) are nothing but *sinful*; nei-  
 “ ther may we rejoice in any works that we do, which all  
 “ be so imperfect and impure, that they are not able to  
 “ stand

“*stand before the righteous judgment-seat of God.*” Homily of the misery of man, 2d part. I have remarked, note 4. that the object of this Homily is to prove the necessity of a Redeemer, in consequence of human imperfection; a necessity, which congruous works, by deserving grace and justification, were conceived to supersede. When therefore it is said, that “*of ourselves, and by ourselves,*” (phrases perpetually repeated,) “we are not able either to think a good thought, or work a good deed,” it is solely meant, that we can do neither so perfectly, as *of ourselves*, or, in other words, *without Christianity*, to obtain God’s favour by congruous merit; because, considered in this point of view, “we are very *sinful*,” (or, what is tantamount to that expression, *imperfect*,) “wretched, and damnable,” or liable to condemnation.

Perhaps the following passages from Latimer may in some degree illustrate the subject under consideration: “First, when he is a right Papist given unto Monckery, I warrant you he is in this opinion, that with his own works he doth merit remission of his sins, and satisfieth the law through and by his own works, and so thinketh himself to be saved everlastingly.

“This is the opinion of all Papists. And this doctrine was taught in times past in schools and in the pulpits. Now all these, that be in such an opinion, they be the enemies of the cross of Christ, of his passion and bloodshedding; for they think in themselves, *Christ needeth not to dye, and so they despise his bitter passion; they do not consider our birth, sin, and the corruption of our nature, nor yet do they know the quantity of our actual sins*; how many times we fall into sins, or how much our own power is diminished, or what power and might the devil hath; they con-

sider

“sider not such things, but think themselves able  
 “*with their own works* to enter into *the kingdom of*  
 “*God.*” Latimer’s Sermons, p. 208. ed. 1584. “We  
 “of our own strength and power are not able to do  
 “his commandments, but that *lack* our Saviour will  
 “supply with his *fulfilling*, and with his *perfectness* he  
 “will take away our *imperfections.*” p. 151. “Though  
 “the works which we do be good outwardly, and  
 “God be pleased with them, yet they be *not perfect*,  
 “for we believe *imperfectly*, we love *imperfectly*, we  
 “suffer *imperfectly*, not as we ought to do, and so all  
 “things that we do are done *imperfectly*. But our  
 “Saviour hath so remedied the matter, and taken  
 “away our *imperfections*, that they be counted now be-  
 “fore God most perfect and holy, not for our own  
 “sake, but for his sake, and though *they be not perfect*,  
 “yet *they be taken for perfect*; and so we come to per-  
 “fectness by him.” p. 166.

The idea of our deficiencies being removed by the  
 fulness of Christ, (not to render good works merito-  
 rious of divine forgiveness, but acceptable to Heaven,  
 and available to eternal life,) our Homilies express al-  
 most in the language of Latimer. It should be ob-  
 served however, that they were composed before his  
 Sermons were preached. “So that now in him and  
 “by him every true Christian man may be called a ful-  
 “filler of the law, forasmuch as *that, which their in-*  
 “*firmity lacked, Christ’s justice hath supplied.*” Homily  
 on salvation.

Upon the whole, is it not evident, that we are thus  
 taught to consider our best works (when abstracted  
 from Christianity, and contemplated *in themselves*) as  
 having “*the nature of sin*,” because they are *imperfect*,  
 and as requiring to have their imperfection supplied  
 by

by the perfection of Christ, in order to become "pleasing to God," and capable "of standing before his righteous judgment-seat?"

Page 114, note (16).

The writings of Melancthon had long enjoyed an unrivalled reputation among the Lutherans. But above all his other productions (the Augsbourg Confession and its Apology alone excepted) ranked his *Loci Theologici*; which, as I have remarked in note 14. Sermon IV. he expressly designed to be a general compendium of the new doctrine, which he composed under the eye and immediate correction of Luther; and which, at the time of our own Reformation, was universally esteemed the standard of Lutheran opinion. Buddæus alludes to its great celebrity at that period, in the following terms: "Initio itaque regnabat in Scholis et Academiis Philippus Melancthon, Locique ejus Theologici passim prælegebantur." *Isagoge*, lib. ii. p. 349; and gives this eulogy upon it, written by a contemporary:

"Non melior liber est ullus post biblia Christi,

"Quam qui doctrinæ corpusque locique vocatur."

Ibid. lib. ii. p. 347.

The works likewise of his opponents in the Church of Rome abundantly testify the very high estimation, in which Melancthon was every where held. This is particularly apparent from the Philippics of his inveterate adversary, Cochläus. "Sed progressum," Cochläus remarks, "et successum hujus sectæ non minus juvit ac promovit (me iudice) Philippus, quam Lutherus. Nam, cum esset ingenio vafro et acuto, atque in grammaticæ, dialecticæque, et rhetoricæ rudimentis comptiori stylo exercitatus, magis nam ubique per Germaniam in Scholis affectus est gratiam et favorem. Unde factum est, ut repente in partes Lutheri traxerit quoslibet eruditos, qui polioribus

“tioribus literis ac linguarum studiis delectabantur.  
 “ . . . . Wormaciæ autem *tanti faciebat* apud me in pri-  
 “vato colloquio *bunc Philippum suum idem Lutherus*, ut  
 “diceret, non vivere hodie ullum hominem super terram,  
 “*qui in sacris literis doctior esset Philippo. . . .*” Then  
 alluding to the extent of his fame, in consequence of  
 the Confession and its Apology, he adds, “*Quare et*  
 “*ipsi Luthero præferebatur in Lutheranorum conventicu-*  
 “*lis*, ac, velut publicus communis principum et civi-  
 “tatum Cancellarius, in eorum scribendis propositi-  
 “onibus et responsonibus habebatur.” Philippica Sep-  
 tima in Philippum Melancthonem, p. 553 et 554. ed.  
 1549.

The sentiments contained in the Loci Theologici upon the activity of the human will in conversion, or rather its cooperation with divine grace, at the commencement, as well as during the continuance, of a disposition to good, have been already pointed out in the note above referred to. It should be added, that the same also frequently occurs in his other publications; from which to quote every passage upon the subject, would be to transcribe no inconsiderable portion of his works. The idea of Calvin upon the point has been adverted to in note 11.

Page 114, note (<sup>17</sup>).

In the “Necessary Erudition,” published under the sanction of royal authority, in the reign of Henry VIII. (note 5. Sermon I.) the liberty of the will was thus fully and unequivocally maintained: “If thou  
 ‘wilt enter into life, keep the commandments,’ which  
 “undoubtedly should be said in vain, unless there  
 “were some faculty or power left in man, whereby he  
 “may, by the help and grace of God, (*if he will re-*  
 “*ceive it when it is offered unto him,*) understand his  
 “commandments, and *freely* consent and obey unto  
 “them.



“ them. . . . In spiritual desires, and works to please  
 “ God, it” (viz. free will) “ is so weak and feeble,  
 “ that it cannot either *begin or perform* them, unless  
 “ by the grace and help of God it be *prevented and*  
 “ *bolpen*. . . . Man’s strength and will, in all things  
 “ which be faithful to the soul, and shall please God,  
 “ hath need of grace of the Holy Ghost, by which  
 “ such spiritual things be inspired to men, and strength  
 “ and constancy given to perform them, if men do not  
 “ *wilfully refuse* the said grace offered to them. . . .”  
 “ It is surely of the grace of God only, that first we  
 “ be inspired and moved to any good thing; but to  
 “ resist temptation, and to persist in goodness, and go  
 “ forward in it, is *both of the grace of God, and of our*  
 “ *free will and endeavour*. . . . God is naturally good,  
 “ and willeth *all* men to be saved, and careth for  
 “ them, and provideth all things, by which they may  
 “ be saved, except *by their own malice* they will be  
 “ evil, and so by righteous judgment of God perish  
 “ and be lost. For truly men be to themselves the  
 “ authors of sin and damnation. God is neither the  
 “ author of sin, nor the cause of damnation. . . . All  
 “ men are brought into such blindness and infirmity,  
 “ that they cannot eschew sin, except they be illu-  
 “ mined and made free by *especial* grace, that is to say,  
 “ by a supernatural help and working of the Holy  
 “ Ghost, which although the goodness of God offer-  
 “ eth to *all* men, yet they only enjoy it, which *by*  
 “ *their free will do accept and embrace the same*.” Article of Free Will. “ Albeit God is the principal cause  
 “ and chief worker of this justification in us, without  
 “ whose grace no man can do no good thing, but fol-  
 “ lowing his free will in the state of a sinner, increas-  
 “ eth his own injustice, and multiplieth his sin; yet  
 “ so it pleaseth the high wisdom of God, that man

“ *prevented* by his grace, (which being offered man may, “ *if he will, refuse or receive,*) shall be also a worker, “ *by his free consent and obedience to the same,* in the *attaining* of his own justification.” Article of Justification.

Such was the doctrine of our Church upon this point in the first stage of her Reformation. That the same continued without change at the completion of it under Edward, seems a fact sufficiently apparent. Perhaps, however, I should add other testimonies from the writings of Erasmus, whose Paraphrase upon the Gospel was ordered by the King’s injunctions, to be provided in every parish, and publicly kept in Churches, for the general instruction of the people, at the time that the use of the Homilies was first enjoined; but as his opinion on the subject is well known, and has been frequently appealed to, it seems only necessary to make a few extracts from his Paraphrase: “ Nothing is let pass on my behalf, whereby “ thou mightest be saved, but contrariwise thou hast “ done what thou canst to bring destruction to thee, “ and to exclude salvation from thee: *But to whom “ free will is once given, he cannot be saved against his “ will.*” Matthew, chap. xxiii. ver. 37. “ The Father doth not give this so great a gift” (viz. faith) “ but to them that be *willing and desirous* to have “ it. And truly who so doth *with a ready will, and “ godly diligence,* deserve to be drawn of my Father, “ he shall obtain everlasting life by me; (Non im- “ partit ille tantum munus, nisi *volentibus et avidis.* “ Quisquis autem *promeruerit sua prompta voluntate “ suoque studio,* ut attrahatur a Patre, per me vitam “ æternam consequetur.) . . . . They that in the mean “ season do not believe, cannot excuse their fault by “ saying that they were not drawn. For the Father,

“ *ſc*

“*so much as in him lieth, (Pater enim, quod in ipso est, &c.)* coveteth to draw all men. He that is not drawn, is in fault himself, because he withdraweth himself from him, that else would draw him.” John vi. 44. “Things of this world are learned by man’s endeavour and study. This celestial philosophy is not understood, unless the secret inspiration of the Father make man’s heart apt to be taught. . . . .” *The gift is God’s, but the endeavour is yours; (Donum est Dei, sed vester est conatus.)* A man heareth my words with bodily ears in vain, except he hear before the secret voice of the Father, which must inspire the mind with an insensible grace of faith. Therefore *whosoever fashioneth himself to be apt to receive this inspiration,* the Father doth then draw them. And he only that is drawn, cometh finally to me. (*Proinde quicumque se præbent idoneos huic afflatui, hos sic attrahit Pater; et is demum venit ad me, qui sic fuerit attractus.*)” Ver. 45.

The *endeavour* or *conatus* here alluded to, as well as the general idea of Erasmus upon preventing and co-operating grace, is thus briefly explained in his *Diatriba*: “*Prævenit Dei misericordia voluntatem nostram, comitatur eandem in conando, dat felicem eventum. Et tamen interim volumus, currimus, assequimur.*” p. 45. ed. 1524. And again in his *Hyperaspistæ*; “*Ego nihil tribui libero Arbitrio, nisi quod se præbet gratiæ pulsanti, quod cooperatur gratiæ operanti, et quod ab utraque se potest avertere.*” Opera, vol. x. p. 1480. ed. Lugd. Bat. 1706. to which, he adds, Luther himself acceded: “*Idem fatetur Lutherus.*”

With the sentiments of Erasmus, thus obtruded on public notice in the reign of Edward, those of Cranmer seem to have perfectly accorded at the same

period. What they were in the preceding reign, the "Necessary Erudition" shews; at least what those were to which he assented, and which probably he drew up himself, as the doctrine of the Church of England; but it has been contended, that little deference is due to that work, because it might have been corrupted by the intrigues of Gardiner, and the caprice of Henry. It may be of importance therefore (as far, I mean, as private opinion can be of importance to illustrate the *general* tendency of any point in a public Creed,) to consider what they were after the death of that Monarch, when they proceeded voluntarily from himself. In his Catechism, translated from the German, the subject is incidentally mentioned. "God is so gentle, liberal, and merciful, that  
 "of his own accord he desireth to do good to *all*  
 "men, whereby his name is praised and honoured.  
 "Therefore he that will do pure service and honour  
 "to God, let him give himself to rest and quietness;  
 "not working to be made holy by his own outward  
 "works," (viz. Popish works of superstition, as, "gadding hither and thither on pilgrimage, painting,  
 "gilding, or clothing Saints' images, &c.") "but  
 "let him keep holy day, let him *suffer the benefits of*  
 "*God to be poured liberally and freely upon him.*" p. 33:  
 "It is *our part* to *give place* to his working, and not  
 "to *withstand* the same. And therefore we say in  
 "this Creed, 'I believe in the Holy Ghost.' But it  
 "is necessary some things here to speak of the manner  
 "of sanctification, how and after what manner the  
 "Holy Ghost doth hallow us, that we may *so prepare*  
 "*ourselves*, or rather *give place* to the Holy Ghost,  
 "which *preventeth* us, that he with his light, and almighty strength and power, may work his will in  
 "us." p. 135. "As much as lieth in you, apply  
 "your-

“yourselfes to hear godly sermons, and give your  
 “hearts to God, *like wax, apt and meet to receive* what  
 “thing soever it shall please him to print in you.”  
 p. 139. “And take this for a sure conclusion, and  
 “doubt nothing thereof, that the Holy Ghost, as he  
 “hath begun these things in us, so he will finish the  
 “same in us, *if we obey him*, and continue in faith  
 “unto the end of our lives. For he that continueth  
 “to the end, shall be saved.” p. 143. “We wretch-  
 “ed sinners do not first *prevent* God, and *go before*  
 “*him* in the work of our justification, but it is God  
 “that layeth the *first foundation* of our salvation. He  
 “beginneth with us, and first calleth us by the Gos-  
 “pel. First he sendeth unto us godly and faithful  
 “ministers, by whom we be baptized, and *before we*  
 “*do any good work*, he *offereth* unto us his grace.”  
 p. 155. “And we Christian men, although by *bap-*  
 “*tism* we be made the children of God, and receive  
 “the Holy Ghost, (which doth *help* us to withstand  
 “all evil, and to do that is good,) and although we  
 “commit no gross sin, nor break the law by any out-  
 “ward act, yet we do not perfectly fulfil God’s com-  
 “mandments.” p. 192. “For this is good and ac-  
 “cepted in the sight of God our Saviour, which  
 “willeth *all* men to be saved, and to come to the  
 “knowledge of the truth. Now therefore, forasmuch  
 “as we know by God’s holy commandments what his  
 “will is, it is *our part* to conform our wills to his will,  
 “and to desire him to give us his *grace and aid*.”  
 p. 171. “He governeth by the holy word of his  
 “Gospel, and the power of the Holy Ghost, (whom  
 “he poureth plentifully upon all them, that believe  
 “the Gospel,) and by that comfortable word of the  
 “Gospel he gently enticeth and draweth us unto him,

“ that we should gladly *of our own free will obey him.*”  
p. 165.

It is evident, from an accurate examination of the authorized Protestant Creeds, that although in some cases the individuals, who composed them, held opinions on many points, more or less approaching towards an extreme, nevertheless in them, as general rules of faith, a mitigated form of expression was always adopted. If Cranmer therefore, who compiled our Articles, had entertained sentiments upon free will even of the harshest description, it would not have followed, that he introduced the same, without modifications, into the Articles themselves : but when we find by the preceding quotations, that his private opinions were of the most moderate kind, surely it is impossible for a moment to doubt the moderation of that public Creed, which he established.

The reformed doctrine of the Church of England, in the time of Henry, was contained in the “ Necessary Erudition.” This doctrine, it is well known, was further reformed in the reign of his successor. It seems therefore to follow, that where other tenets on particular points were subsequently brought forward, repugnant to those, which are there to be found, as upon transubstantiation, &c. that book ceases to prove illustrative of her meaning ; yet that where, as in the present instance, not different, but the same ideas, and either the same, or synonymous expressions were afterwards used, it ought to be admitted as evidence of it. In the Latin edition of this work, published the same year, (viz. 1543.) entitled, “ Pia et Catholica Christiani Hominis Institutio,” occur the following passages : “ Interim tamen meminisse oportet hanc potentiam infirmiore esse quam ut ad ea, *quæ Deo placita et accepta sunt,*

“ *sunt, vel cogitanda vel facienda* sese incitare possit nisi  
 “ *Dei auxilio* ad id sublevetur. . . . Cæterum, ut ex mul-  
 “ tis scripturæ locis probari potest libertas arbitrii, ita  
 “ haud pauciores sunt, qui demonstrant, sic requiri  
 “ *gratiam Dei*, ut nisi *ea* liberum arbitrium et præve-  
 “ niat, et comitetur, et deducet, nihil boni aut sancti  
 “ operis a nobis confici, aut animo saltem, ac volun-  
 “ tate constitui possit. . . . Ubi autem nobis *Christi*  
 “ *gratia* affulserit, jam ad salutem *ipsi* nostram coopera-  
 “ mur.” Art. de Libero Arbitrio. How exactly with  
 these accords that part of our Article, which was al-  
 tered from St. Austin, and which comprised the  
 whole of it, as first composed: “ Absque *gratia Dei*,  
 “ quæ per *Christum* est, nos præveniente, ut velimus, et  
 “ cooperante, dum volumus, ad opera pietatis facienda,  
 “ quæ Deo grata sunt et accepta, nihil valemus.”





---

## NOTES

### ON SERMON VI.

Page 118, note (1).

JUSTIFICATION is thus defined by Aquinas : “ Pri-  
mo quæritur, an justificatio impii sit remissio pecca-  
torum ? Et videtur, quod non. . . . Sed *contra* est,  
quod dicitur in Glossa Rom. viii. super illud, ‘ Quos  
‘ vocavit, hos et justificavit,’ Glo. remissione peccato-  
rum ; ergo *remissio peccatorum est justificatio.*” Quæ-  
stiones Disput. quæst. 28. art. 1.

In the Loci Theologici Melancthon expresses him-  
self to the same effect : “ Justificatio significat *remissio-*  
*nem peccatorum, et reconciliationem seu acceptationem ad*  
*vitam æternam.*” De Gratia et Justificatione.

Our own Church, in the reign of Henry, almost li-  
terally adopted the definition of Melancthon : “ Justi-  
fication signifies *remission of our sins*, and our *accepta-*  
*tion or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God.*”  
Articles of 1536, art. Justification.

The same idea likewise occurs in our Homilies, in  
which it is said, “ Every man of necessity is con-  
strained to seek for another *justification*, to be re-  
ceived at God’s hands, that is to say, *the remission,*  
*pardon, and forgiveness of his sins and trespasses*, in  
such things as he has offended.” Homily of the sal-  
vation of mankind, ed. 1547.

Page

Page 119, note (2).

Ad oppositum. Impossibile est aliquem esse *carum* Deo sine *caritate*, sicut impossibile est aliquem esse *album* sine *albedine*; sed caritas est qualitas absoluta, quia est virtus theologica; ergo &c. Ad istam quæstionem est *una* opinio, quod ad hoc, *quod anima sit Deo grata, cara, et accepta, necessario requiritur aliqua talis forma* creata et absoluta, ita quod de potentia Dei absoluta sine tali forma non potest esse Deo cara; et ipsa forma necessario est Deo *cara*, et similiter *anima illa forma informata*; ita quod, stante illa forma, non potest de potentia Dei absoluta non esse Deo cara. Occam, lib. i. dist. 17. quæst. 1.

Page 122, note (3).

“ Et prædictis patet solutio quæstionis, videlicet, “ *quod ad deletionem peccati mortalis post baptismum commissi, requiritur pœnitentia*, quia ad deletionem peccati requiritur punitio voluntaria, ut dictum est. “ Pœnitentia autem est huiusmodi, ut patet ex prædictis: ergo, &c.” Nic. de Orbellis, lib. iv. dist. 14. quæst. 1.

Scotus accurately defines the difference between attrition and contrition, and ascribes the true merit of justification to the former. “ De tertio dico, quod aliquem actum humanum requiri ad deletionem peccati potest *dupliciter* intelligi, vel ut *dispositionem præviam*, vel ut *concomitantem*. Primo modo sufficit actus *informis*; immo semper est informis, quia dispositio prævia ad peccati deletionem est semper sine gratia et caritate; a cuius solius inhærentia et inclinatione ad actum dicitur actus formatus. Nam in illo instanti, in quo deletur peccatum, caritas inest, et per consequens, si actus requiritur, ut concomitans requiritur, ut formatus.

“ Ad hujus intellectum sciendum, quod peccator in  
“ pecca-

“ peccatis existens, eo modo quo datum est in præce-  
 “ dente quæstione, art. 1. peccatum manere post ac-  
 “ tum, potest *ex naturalibus cum communi influentia*,  
 “ considerare peccatum commissum, ut offensivum Deo,  
 “ et ut contra legem divinam, et sub multis talibus  
 “ rationibus ; et potest voluntas ipsum, sub aliqua il-  
 “ larum rationum, vel sub multis, illud peccatum sic  
 “ consideratum detestari, et ille motus potest conti-  
 “ nuari et intendi *ante infusionem gratiæ*. Potest etiam  
 “ ista detestatio esse totaliter circumstantionata circum-  
 “ stantiis moralibus debitis ; non est enim verisimile,  
 “ quod necesse sit propter peccatum istud remanens  
 “ actum quencunque circa peccatum commissum esse  
 “ defectivum in aliqua circumstantia morali. Iste au-  
 “ tem motus dicitur *attritio*, et est dispositio, sive *meri-*  
 “ *tum de congruo*, ad *deletionem* peccati mortalis, *quæ*  
 “ *sequitur in ultimo instanti* alicujus temporis, in quo  
 “ tempore ista attritio duravit. . . . *Idem motus, qui*  
 “ *prius fuit attritio, in illo instanti fit contritio*, quia in  
 “ illo instanti fit *concomitans gratiæ*, et ita *actus forma-*  
 “ *tus*, quia habens secum *caritatem*, *quæ est forma ac-*  
 “ *tus*, ut hic loquimur. Ibi tamen oportet distinguere  
 “ signa naturæ inter actum, ut est talis inesse naturæ et  
 “ moris, et inter caritatem et inter actum, ut est for-  
 “ matus, quia in primo signo naturæ est ibi actus talis,  
 “ in secundo caritas, in tertio actus formatus a caritate,  
 “ jam inclinante et inhærente, et sic *attritio fit contritio*,  
 “ sine omni mutatione reali ipsius actus. Contra ergo  
 “ non per contritionem deletur culpa, quia non est  
 “ contritio nisi in tertio signo naturæ, et in secundo  
 “ deletur ; neque etiam per contritionem illam, ut per  
 “ meritum, quia sequitur illam deletionem. Potest  
 “ ergo dici, quod Deus disponit per *attritionem* in ali-  
 “ quo tempore, *tanquam per aliquod meritum de congruo*,  
 “ in aliquo instanti dare gratiam, et pro illa attritione,

“ *ut pro merito, justificat, sicut est meritum justificationis.*  
 “ Et licet non continuaretur idem actus circa pecca-  
 “ tum in genere naturæ et moris, qui prius, adhuc in  
 “ illo instanti infunderetur gratia, quia jam præcessit me-  
 “ ritum de congruo.” Scotus, lib. iv. dist. 14. quæst. 2.

The change of eternal into temporal punishment is noticed in the Apology of the Augsbourg Confession: “ Sic enim” (viz. adversarii) “ docent, in remissione peccati Deum remittere culpam; et tamen, quia convenit justitiæ divinæ punire peccatum, mutare pœnam æternam in pœnam temporalem. Addunt amplius partem illius temporalis pœnæ remitti potestate clavium, reliquum autem redimi per satisfactiones.” De Pœnitentia. See Aquinas, Summa Prim. Secund. quæst. 86. art. 4.

But it was believed, that although temporal punishment usually remains to be exacted, after eternal is expiated, yet the act of contrition may prove sufficiently intense to atone likewise for that. “ Respon-  
 “ deo dicendum quod intentio contritionis potest at-  
 “ tendi dupliciter. Uno modo *ex parte caritatis* in ac-  
 “ tu, quod contritio inde sequens merebitur non solum  
 “ *amotionem*, sed etiam *absolutionem*, ab omni pœna.  
 “ Alio modo *ex parte doloris sensibilis*, quem voluntas  
 “ in contritione excitat; et quia illi etiam pœna quæ-  
 “ dam est, tantum potest intendi, quod sufficiet ad de-  
 “ letionem culpæ et pœnæ.” Aquin. Sum. The. tert. quæst. 5. art. 2. “ Item notandum, quod actus con-  
 “ tritionis potest esse *ita intensus*, quod pœnitens me-  
 “ reatur remissionem *totius* pœnæ peccato debitæ; ita  
 “ quod, si post completum motum illius contritionis  
 “ decederet, nullam pœnam in purgatorio sustineret.” Nic. de Orbellis, lib. iv. dist. 14. quæst. 2.

Page 123, note (\*).

Independently of the divine precept, which was  
 conceived

conceived to enjoin the Sacrament of penance, the Schools held that Sacrament to be necessary on another account; on account of the difficulty in ascertaining the sufficiency of contrition. “Ad primum ergo  
 “dicendum, quod aliquis non potest esse *certus*, quod  
 “contritio sua sit *sufficiens* ad deletionem pœnæ et cul-  
 “pæ; et ideo tenetur *confiteri et satisfacere*; maxime  
 “cum contritio vera non fuerit, nisi propositum confi-  
 “tendi habuisset annexum, quod debet ad effectum re-  
 “duci etiam propter præceptum, quod est de confessio-  
 “ne datum.” Aquin. Sum. The. tert. quæst. 5. art. 2.  
 It should be observed, that when the Sacrament of Penitence was said to consist in these three parts, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, in the word contrition, attrition was always included; the former being frequently put for penitential sorrow in general, whether proceeding from the operation of the human mind alone, or in conjunction with grace. The Scotists however usually expressed themselves correctly upon the point.

The great mercy of God in accepting a more easy expiation of crime, effected through the Sacrament, in lieu of one, which requires the perfect virtue itself, is thus described by Nicolaus de Orbellis, upon the principles, and in the language, of Scotus: “In eodem  
 “enim instanti temporis est deletio culpæ, et infusio  
 “gratiæ, vel caritatis. Sicut adultus potest habere  
 “primam gratiam delentem originale peccatum du-  
 “plici via, scilicet, vel ex bono motu disponente de  
 “congruo ad istam gratiam, vel ex susceptione bap-  
 “tismi; sic in proposito. Et hoc est majoris miseri-  
 “cordiæ *duplicem* viam scilicet instituere, per quam  
 “*justificetur* peccator, quam ipsum ad *unam* viam arc-  
 “tare, tum etiam quia in susceptione gratiæ per sacra-  
 “mentum non requiritur attritio, quæ sit memoria de  
 “con-

“ congruo, sicut in *prima* susceptione, sed *sufficit*, quod  
 “ suscipiens sacramentum non ponat obicem peccati mor-  
 “ talis in voluntate tunc actualiter existentis, et quod  
 “ habeat aliqualem attritionem, seu displicentiam de pec-  
 “ catis commissis, cum proposito cavendi de futuro, et quod  
 “ velit suscipere Sacramentum Pœnitentiæ, sicut dis-  
 “ pensatur in Ecclesia. Talis enim in ultimo instanti  
 “ prolutionis verborum recipit effectum Sacramenti,  
 “ scilicet, gratiam pœnitentialem; et illa attritio fit  
 “ contritio, non quidem ex merito, quia dispositio illa  
 “ non erat *sufficiens* per modum meriti, sed ex pacto  
 “ Dei assistentis suo Sacramento ad effectum illum,  
 “ ad quem institutum est.” Lib. iv. dist. 14. quæst. 2.

Page 124, note (5).

The Lutherans frequently maintained, that, as Christians, we ought not to doubt of God's will towards us, but, repenting and believing, to be persuaded, that we are certainly restored to his favour. This position, however, was not in any way connected with that of a secret and personal Predestination, but was solely levelled against a very lucrative and highly offensive doctrine of the Church of Rome, the uncertainty respecting a due obliteration of crime, by penitential merit, in the mind of the individual. “ Multis indicavi,” said Luther, “ *Christianum hominem oportere certissime statuere se esse in gratia Dei, et habere clamorem Spiritus Sancti in corde suo. Hoc ideo feci, ut omnino discamus repudiare pestilentissimam opinionem totius regnæ Papæ, hominem incertum debere esse de gratia Dei erga se. Hac opinione stante, Christus plane nihil prodest. Num, quia de gratia Dei erga se dubitat, illum necesse est etiam dubitare de promissionibus divinis, et per consequens de voluntate Dei, de Christi beneficiis, quod pro nobis passus, mortuus est, resurrexit, &c.* Nulla autem major blasphemia  
 “ in

“ in Deum est, quam negare ejus promissa, negare  
 “ Deum ipsum, Christum, &c. Ideo extrema fuit non  
 “ solum dementia, sed etiam impietas, quod Monachi  
 “ tanto studio allexerunt juventutem utriusque sexus  
 “ in Monasteria, ad religiones, et ordines sanctos, ut  
 “ vocaverunt, tanquam *ad certissimum statum salutis* :  
 “ et tamen postea allectos jusserunt *dubitare de gratia*  
 “ *Dei*. . . . Hoc Papa nescit ; ideo impie nugatur cum  
 “ suis furiis, neminem scire, ne justos quidem et sapien-  
 “ tes, utrum digni sunt amore, &c. Imo *si justi et*  
 “ *sapientes sunt, certo sciunt se diligere a Deo*, vel justis et  
 “ sapientibus *non sunt*. . . . Papa igitur hoc impio dog-  
 “ mate, quo jussit homines dubitare de favore Dei erga  
 “ se, *subtulit Deum et omnes promissiones de Ecclesia, ob-*  
 “ *ruit benefacta Christi, et totum Evangelium abolevit.*”

Vol. v. p. 379, 380. Nor, while arguing against the  
 Papistical doctrine of penitential doubt, did he, on the  
 other hand, contend for a certainty, which the pre-  
 sumptuous sinner could abuse, but for one of a more  
 rational description, founded upon the stability of God's  
 nature and promises, and solely applicable to those  
 who forsake their sins. “ Cur nunc de voluntate Dei  
 “ erga te *dubites*, postquam per Filium Dei Deo recon-  
 “ ciliatus es ? Sed inquires, ‘ Peccator sum ; offendi  
 ‘ Deum ; nec parvi voluntati ejus ita, ut par erat.’  
 “ Sit hæc quoque. Non enim negabimus peccatum.  
 “ Tu igitur mutatus es, ex bono factus es malus, ex  
 “ filio factus es inobediens. Sed nunc ideo statues  
 “ Deum quoque mutatum, aut alium factum ? Quin  
 “ *discede a malo*. Peccasti. *Peccare desine* : pete ve-  
 “ niam : *spera* per Christum Deum sic tibi reconcilia-  
 “ tum, ut reconciliatio sit æterna, non unius aut alte-  
 “ rius diei, vel anni, sed perpetua ; et comperies pro-  
 “ phetam non mentitum, qui eum vocat (christum)

“placabilem, mitem, benignum, clementem.” Id. vol. iv. p. 358. See also note 11.

The supposed efficacy of the Sacraments, particularly of the Mass, *ex opere operato*, was taught by all the Scholastics, and severely reprobated by the Lutherans. The Apology of the Augsbourgh Confession thus notices it: “Hic damnamus totum populum Scholasticorum doctorum, qui docent, quod Sacramenta non ponenti obicem conferant gratiam ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis. Hæc simpliciter Judaica opinio est sentire, quod per ceremoniam justificemur, sine bono motu cordis, hoc est, sine fide.” Art. de Ufu et Numero Sacramentorum. “Repudiandi sunt et reliqui communes errores, quod Missa conferat gratiam ex opere operato facienti. Item quod applicata pro aliis, etiam injustis, non ponentibus obicem mereatur eis remissionem peccatorum, culpæ, et poenæ. Hæc omnia falsa et impia sunt, nuper ab indoctis Monachis conficta, et obruunt gloriam passionis Christi, et iustitiam fidei.” Art. de Missa. “Nemo enim sanus illam Pharisaicam et Ethnicam persuasionem de opere operato probare potest. Et tamen hæc persuasio hæret in populo; hæc auxit in infinitum Missarum numerum. Conducuntur enim Missæ ad iram Dei placandam, et hoc opere remissionem culpæ aut poenæ consequi volunt; volunt impetrare quidquid in omni vita opus est; volunt etiam mortuos liberare. Hanc Pharisaicam opinionem docuerunt in Ecclesia sophistæ.” Ibid.

Page 125, note (6).

“Sects and feigned religions were neither the fortieth part so many among the Jews, nor more superstitiously and ungodly abused, than of late days they have been among us. Which sects and religions  
“had



“ had so many hypocritical and feigned works in their  
 “ state of religion, (as they arrogantly named it,) that  
 “ their lamps (as they said) ran always over, able to  
 “ *satisfy*, not only for their own sins, but also for all  
 “ other their benefactors, brothers, and sisters of reli-  
 “ gion, as most ungodly and craftily they had per-  
 “ suaded the multitude of ignorant people; keeping  
 “ in divers places (as it were) marts or markets of  
 “ merits, being full of their holy relics, images,  
 “ shrines, and works of overflowing abundance, ready  
 “ to be sold.”

“ Let us rehearse some other kinds of Papistical su-  
 “ perstitions and abuses, as of beads of Lady Psalters  
 “ and Rosaries . . . . of superstitious fastings, of frater-  
 “ nities, or brotherhoods, of pardons, with such-like  
 “ merchandize, which were so esteemed and abused,  
 “ to the great prejudice of God’s glory and command-  
 “ ments, that they were made *most high and holy*  
 “ things, whereby *to attain to the everlasting life, or re-*  
 “ *mission of sins.*” Homily of good works.

The Confession of Augsbourgh thus refers to the  
 same superstitious means of appeasing the anger of  
 Heaven: “ *Constat autem Monachos docuisse, quod*  
 “ *factitiæ religiones satisfaciant pro peccatis, mereantur*  
 “ *gratiam et justificationem.* Quid hoc est aliud, quam  
 “ *de gloria Christi detrahere, et obscurare ac negare justi-*  
 “ *tiam fidei?* . . . . Hi, qui votis tribuunt justificatio-  
 “ nem, tribuunt propriis operibus hoc, quod proprie  
 “ ad gloriam Christi pertinet. Neque vero negari po-  
 “ test, quin Monachi docuerunt, *se per vota et observa-*  
 “ *tiones suas justificari, et mereri remissionem peccatorum;*  
 “ imo affinxerunt *absurdiora*, et dixerunt *se aliis mu-*  
 “ *tuari sua opera.*” De Ceremonialibus, art. 6. ed.  
 1530. “ Olim vexabantur conscientiae doctrina ope-  
 “ rum, non audiebant ex Evangelio consolationem;

“ quosdam conscientia expulit in desertum, in monasteria, sperantes, ibi *se gratiam merituros esse per vitam*  
 “ *Monasticam*. Alii alia excogitaverunt opera *ad pro-*  
 “ *merendam gratiam, et satisfaciendum pro peccatis*. Id-  
 “ *eo* magnopere fuit opus hanc doctrinam *de fide in*  
 “ *Christum* tradere et renovare, ne deesset consolatio  
 “ pavidis conscientis, sed scirent fide in Christum ap-  
 “ prehendi gratiam, et remissionem peccatorum, et jus-  
 “ tificationem.” Id. art. 20.

Upon the doctrine of satisfaction indeed, which, in the vulgar idea, was conceived to be the principal mode of expiating crime, so various were the devices of the Church of Rome, that it is not easy even to enumerate them. “ Restat tertius actus de satisfactionibus. Hic vero habent confusissimas disputationes. Fingunt æternas pœnas mutari in pœnas purgatorii. Et harum partem remitti potestate clavium, partem docent redimendam esse satisfactionibus. Addunt amplius, quod oporteat satisfactiones esse opera supererogationis, et hæc constituunt in stultissimis observationibus, velut in peregrinationibus Rosariis, aut similibus observationibus, quæ non habent mandata Dei. Deinde, sicut purgatorium satisfactionibus redimunt; ita excogitata est ars redimendi satisfactiones, quæ fuit quæstuosissima. Vendunt enim indulgentias, quas interpretantur esse remissiones satisfactionum. Et hic quæstus non solum *ex vivis*, sed *multo amplior est ex mortuis*. Neque solum indulgentiis, sed etiam sacrificio Missæ redimunt satisfactiones mortuorum; denique infinita res est de satisfactionibus. Inter hæc scandala, non enim possumus enumerare omnia, et doctrinas dæmoniorum, *jacet obruta doctrina de justitia fidei in Christum, et de beneficio Christi*.” Apolog. Confess. August. art. de Pœnitentia.

It may be necessary perhaps to add, that no tenet of  
 the

the Scholastical theology was more abused in practice, than that of satisfaction. Nor seldom was its supposed effect totally misconceived. When, however, correctly understood, it implied only that part of penitence, which the *justified* person, already *contrite and absolved*, is bound to perform, in order to exempt himself from *temporal* punishment, and not that, which is requisite to obtain his *justification*; a blessing thought to be previously received, with the obliteration of his fault, and the remission of *eternal* punishment. “His autem concurrentibus, justificatur homo prius peccator. “Quum enim in peccato mortali sunt tria, (ut dictum est supra,) videlicet, *deordinatio actus, privatio gratiæ,* “(ratione cujus dicitur peccatori offensus, quia subtrahit ei gratiam, quæ est ad solum amicum,) et *reatus pænæ æternæ,* per contritionem reordinatur voluntas “in actu, per gratiam remittitur offensa, et per consequens pœna æterna, quæ est ad inimicum, commutatur in temporalem, quæ potest esse ad amicum et ad concivem; et sic, licet sit debitor pœnæ, non est tamen debitor pœnæ *impij*, sed pœnitentis et *justificati*. . . . Ad aliud dicendum, quod plena et perfecta justificatio impij, quoad pœnam culpæ debitam, requirit satisfactionem, quæ frequenter sequitur infusionem gratiæ, tamen quia pœna debita post infusionem gratiæ, *non est æterna*, quæ debetur impijs, secundum illud Esâ. xxvi. ‘In terra sanctorum iniqua gessit, et non videbit gloria Domini;’ sed est *temporalis*, cujus *justificatus* potest esse debitor; ideo, non obstante tali debito, *peccator* dicitur ex solis præcedentibus *justificatus*.” Durandus de S. Porciâno, lib. iv. dist. 17. quæst. 1.

Page 125, note (7).

“Men’s dreams and phantastical inventions.” Cranmer’s Answer to Gardiner, p. 14. So anxious were

our Reformers to discourage the placing of a groundless trust in superstitious works of every description, that in the Injunctions of Edward they thus severely expressed themselves against those, which were of apparently a trivial nature. "The persons above rehearsed shall make, or cause to be made, in their Churches, and every other cure they have, one Sermon every quarter of a year, at the least, wherein they shall purely and sincerely declare the word of God, and in the same exhort their hearers to works of faith, mercy, and charity, specially prescribed and commanded in Scripture, and that *works devised by men's phantasies* beside Scripture, as wandering on pilgrimages, offering of money, candles, or tapers, or relics, or images, or kissing and licking of the same, praying upon beads, or such-like superstition, have not only no promise of reward in Scripture, but contrarywise *great threats and maledictions of God*, for that they be things tending to idolatry and superstition." Sparrow's Collection, p. 2.

Page 126, note (\*).

Without the virtue of repentance, Aquinas expressly states, that mortal sin is not remissible. "Respondeo dicendum, quod impossibile est peccatum actuale mortale sine pœnitentia remitti, loquendo de pœnitentia, quæ est virtus." Summa tert. p. quæst. 86. art. 2. And it should be recollected, that in the Sacrament of penitence, some portion at least of this virtue was supposed always to exist, although the ingenuity of Scholastical, and the avarice of Papistical, philosophy had diminished that portion to nothing more, than the mere non-resistance of grace.

The term *justification* was thus minutely defined: "Dicendum quod *justificatio* passive accepta importat motum ad justitiam, sicut et calefactio motum ad calorem."

“*rem. . . .* Alio modo potest fieri hujusmodi justitia in  
 “homine secundum rationem motus, qui est *de contra-*  
 “*rio in contrarium*, et secundum hoc *justificatio* impor-  
 “*tat transmutationem quandam de statu injustitiæ ad sta-*  
 “*tum justitiæ prædictæ*. Et hoc modo loquimur *de*  
 “*justificatione impij*, secundum illud Apostoli ad Rom.  
 “iv. ‘Et qui non operatur, credenti autem in eum,  
 “qui justificat impium,’ &c. Et quia *motus* denomina-  
 “tur magis *a termino ad quem, quam a termino a quo*,  
 “ideo hujusmodi transmutatio, qua aliquis transmuta-  
 “tur a statu injustitiæ per remissionem peccati, sortitur  
 “nomen *a termino ad quem*, et vocatur *justificatio impij*.”  
 Ibid. quæst. 113. art. 1.

Page 126, note (9).

Isaiah lx. 19.

Page 127, note (10).

Luther thus acknowledges his own literary defects, in his confidential letters to his friends : “Mitto hic  
 “sermonem de Scholis, *plane Lutheranum*, et *Lutheri*  
 “*verbositate* nihil authorem suum negans, sed plenissi-  
 “me referens. Sic sum.” Philip. Melancthon. Epistolæ  
 Luth. ed. Budd. p. 186. “Meus vero” (viz. Sermo)  
 “præterquam quod artibus dicendi imperitus et incul-  
 “tus, *nihil nisi sylvam et chaos verborum evomuit* ; tum  
 “etiam eo fato agitur, ut *turbulentus et impetuosus ve-*  
 “*lut luctator cum monstris infinitis semper congregi co-*  
 “*gatur. . . .* Solor tamen meipsum, quod existimem,  
 “immo sciam, Patrem illum familias cœlestem, pro  
 “magnitudine suæ domus, etiam opus habere uno et  
 “altero servo, duro contra duos, et aspero contra as-  
 “peros, veluti malo cuneo in malos nodos. Et to-  
 “nanti Deo opus est non tantum pluvia irrigante, sed  
 “etiam tonitru concutiente, et fulgure auras purgante,  
 “quo felicius et copiosius terra fructificet.” J. Brentio.  
 Ibid. p. 193. “Mihi, ut videtis, Latinæ linguæ mo-  
 “dicus

“dicus est usus, qui in barbarie Scholasticorum doctorum  
 “*ætatem consumpsi.*” Balthaf. Alterio. Ibid. p. 287.

Page 129, note (11).

In the Apology of their Confession, the Lutherans were particularly solicitous to prevent the possibility of disconnecting faith from repentance: “Quare intelligunt omnes boni viri utiliter et pie reprehensam esse doctrinam sophistarum et canonistarum de pœnitentia. Nam hæc dogmata aperte falsa sunt, et non solum aliena a scripturis sacris, sed etiam ab ecclesiasticis patribus. 1. Quod per opera extra gratiam facta mereamur ex pacto divino gratiam. 2. Quod per attritionem mereamur gratiam. . . . 9. Quod susceptio sacramenti pœnitentiæ, ex opere operato, *sine bono motu utentis*, hoc est, *sine fide in Christum*, confertur gratiam. . . . Nos igitur ut explicaremus pias conscientias ex his labyrinthis sophistarum, constituimus duas partes pœnitentiæ, videlicet, *contritionem, et fidem*. Si quis volet addere *tertiam*, videlicet, *dignos fructus pœnitentiæ*, hoc est, *mutationem totius vitæ ac morum in melius non refragabimur.*” De Pœnitentia, p. 40. “Sed quia adversarii, nominatim hoc damnant, quod diximus, homines fide consequi remissionem peccatorum, addemus paucas quasdam probationes, ex quibus intelligi potest, remissionem peccatorum contingere *non ex opere operato propter contritionem, sed fide illa speciali, qua unusquisque credit sibi remitti peccata*. Nam hic Articulus præcipuus est, de quo digladiamur cum adversariis, et cujus cognitionem ducimus maxime necessariam esse *Christianis omnibus*. . . . Adversarii, cum de fide loquuntur, et dicunt eam præcedere pœnitentiam, intelligunt fidem non hanc, quæ justificat, sed quæ in genere credit Deum esse, pœnas propositas esse impiis, &c, Nos præter illam fidem requirimus, *ut credat sibi quisque remitti*  
 “*peccata.*”

“*peccata. De hac fide speciali litigamus, et opponimus eam opinioni, quæ jubet confidere, non in promissione Christi, sed in opere operato contritionis, confessionis, et satisfactionum.*” Ibid. p. 42. We here perceive what the Lutherans meant by the terms, “special faith,” which have been in later times so differently appropriated by the Calvinists: we see, that their only object was to teach the drooping penitent, by a *special*, opposed to a *general*, faith in Christianity, the necessity of grounding his individual hope of pardon upon the promise of Christ, and not upon the inherent efficacy of his own contrition, confession, and satisfactions. Nor, when we read the following explicit passage in the works of Luther, will it be possible for us to suppose, that he ever contended for an assurance in divine forgiveness upon the contracted principle of personal election. “*Fides acquisita seu sophistarum infusa, de Christo dicit, ‘Credo Filium Dei passum et resuscitatum,’ atque hic definit. Sed vera fides dicit, ‘Credo quidem Filium Dei passum et resuscitatum, sed hoc totam pro me, pro peccatis meis, de quo certus sum. Est enim pro totius mundi peccatis mortuus. Ac certissimum est, me esse partem aliquam mundi, ergo certissimum est pro meis quoque peccatis mortuum esse.*” Opera, vol. i. p. 386.

That they inculcated a faith, which is only to be found in penitence, their Apology sufficiently proves: “*Item fides illa, de qua loquimur, existit in pœnitentia. . . . Quare non potest existere in his, qui secundum carnem vivunt, qui delectantur cupiditatibus suis, et obtemperant eis. . . . Quare fides illa, quæ accipit remissionem peccatorum in corde perterrefacto et fugiente peccatum, non manet in his, qui obtemperant cupiditatibus, nec existit cum mortali peccato.*” De Dilectione, &c. p. 13. “*Hæc fides, de qua loquimur,*  
“*existit*

“*existit in pœnitentia.*” Responsio ad Argum. &c. p. 29. “Fides non manet in his, qui abjiciunt pœnitentiam; sicut supra diximus, fidem *existere in pœnitentia.*” De Ufu et Numero Sacram. p. 60.

Indeed, Melancthon had before strongly impressed the same idea in the Articles which he drew up for the Visitation of the Saxon Churches: “Pastores debent exemplum Christi sequi, qui, quoniam pœnitentiam et remissionem peccatorum docet, debent eadem et ipsi tradere Ecclesiis. *Nunc vulgare est vociferare de fide, et tamen intelligi, quid sit fides non potest, nisi prædicata pœnitentia.* Plane vinum novum in utres veteres infundunt, qui fidem sine pœnitentia, sine doctrina timoris Dei, sine doctrina legis prædicant, et ad carnalem quandam securitatem assuefaciunt vulgus. Et securitas est deterior, quam plerique errores antea sub papatu fuerunt. *Hoc genus concionatorum describit Hier. et vituperat eos, qui dicunt, Pax, pax, et non est pax.*” Art. Pastorum Officium, ed. 1530. “Hi, qui docent in Ecclesiis, tradant doctrinam legis, alioqui, ubi doctrina fidei sine lege traditur, *infinita scandala oriuntur, vulgus fit securum, et somniant se habere iustitiam fidei, quia nesciunt fidem in his tantum esse posse, qui habent contrita per legem corda.*” Art. de Lege. Such was the faith which they maintained, when they spoke of that principle as the medium of Christian consolation. It is nevertheless necessary to add, that they sometimes used the word in a more extended sense, as embracing the whole of Christianity. “Sacrilgium itaque est *ordines religiosorum sanctos appellare. Una religio sancta et sanctificans est, Christianismus, seu fides.*” Opera Lutheri, vol. i. p. 376. “Duæ sunt partes fidei, *sive religionis Christianæ*; pœnitentia nempe, sive contritio ob peccata, deinde fiducia de remissione  
“pecca-



“peccatorum. Tertia est vitæ Christianæ, five bonorum operum exercitium.” Art. Vifit. Saxon. apud Seckendorf. lib. ii. feët. 13. §. 36.

Page 129, note (12).

How much foever any ftrong expreffions of Luther upon the fubject of faith, which he folety oppofed to the Scholaftical doctrine of merit, may have been mifunderftood, as verging towards fanaticifm, it is certain, that he himfelf never intended to give them that bias. “Ex hoc tamen non fequitur, quod debeas peccatum extenuare aut contemnere, quia Deus illud non imputat. Non imputat quidem; fed quibus, et propter quid? Non duris et fecuris, fed pœnitentiam agentibus, et fide apprehendentibus Chriftum propitiato-rem, propter quem ut remittuntur eis omnia peccata, ita et reliquæ peccati eis non imputantur.” Opera, vol. v. p. 421. “Chriftiana libertate hodie abutuntur plurimi, dicentes, ‘Gratia, gratia; ergo non eft opus bona facere aut mala pati.’ Ibid. p. 14. “Nemo præfumat per fomnium id atque cogitationem de fide, quam ipfe fibi finxit, fe in illud” (regnum cœlorum) ingreffurum. Fide opus eft viva, quæque probata et exercitata” (bonis operibus) “fit egregie. Sed proh Deus! ut pignantia cum hoc loco et fcripferunt et prædicarunt noſtri impoſtores, non doctores, afferentes, qui minutiffimum duntaxat gradum, et vel ſcintillulam aliquam fidei moriturus habuerit, hunc ſalutem aſſecuturum.” Vol. v. p. 448. “Pœnitentia omnium teſtimonio et vero, eft dolor de peccato, eum adjuncto propoſito melioris vitæ.” Diſput. contra Antinomos. Id. vol. i. p. 401. “Cavenda igitur doctrina Papiftarum de pœnitentia, ſicut ipſe infernus et diabolus. Multo magis cavendi ſunt, qui nullam prorsus pœnitentiam in Eccleſia relinquunt.” Ibid. p. 404. “Fœdus eft error, quod quiſpiam de peccatis ſe putet ſatisfactu-  
rum;

“ruin ; quæ ex inestimabili clementia Deus et semper  
 “et gratis remittit atque condonat, *nihil a nobis in-  
 “veni ceni requirens, quam ut in posterum bene vivamus*” Id.  
 vol. i. p. 59. When speaking of divine, as opposed to  
 human, excommunication for crime, he adds ; “Sed  
 “non perpetuo ab eis aberit judicium Dei. Homines  
 “fallunt ; Deum fallere non possunt. Is in novissimo  
 “die colliget per angelos omnia scandala, et conjiciet  
 “in æternum ignem. Ab hac Dei excommunicatione  
 “occulta qui volet liberari, *caveat peccata, et pœniten-  
 “tiam agat, hoc est, emendet vitam, deinde prece-  
 “dat veniam per Christum. Hæc unica via est illam  
 “occultam Dei excommunicationem effugiendi.*” Id.  
 vol. v. p. 381.

Upon the peculiar application of the doctrine, that  
 we are justified by faith alone, to the conscience of the  
 penitent sinner, alarmed by the recollection of his past  
 transgressions, Melancthon delivers himself in the most  
 explicit terms : “Est sane *παράδοξον* dicere, quod sola  
 “fide iusti sumus, *multum enim scandalorum videtur pa-  
 “tere legis abrogatio ;* sed hæc doctrina pertinet *non ad  
 “vitam externam, sed ad certamen conscientie* luctantis  
 “cum iudicio Dei. . . . Justificatio autem apud Pau-  
 “lum intelligitur *relative de acceptance.* Non sumus  
 “iusti, *neque operibus, neque novitate nostra post regene-  
 “rationem, sed sola misericordia,* si tamen accipiamus  
 “eam fide. *Fides autem ipsa est notitia vera Dei, legis  
 “obedientia, inchoatio vite æternæ ;* Joân. xvii. ‘Hæc  
 ‘est vita æterna, ut agnoscant te solum Deum verum,  
 “et quem misisti, Jesum Christum.” Opera Lutheri,  
 vol. i. p. 484. Disputationes Melancthonis. What  
 the Lutherans meant by the word *Regeneration*, when  
 they confined it not strictly to its proper sense, *Bap-  
 tismal renovation*, we learn from their Apology : “Nos  
 “dicimus quod *pœnitentiam, hoc est, conversionem, seu*  
 “*rege-*

“*regenerationem*, boni fructus, bona opera, in omni  
“*vita sequi debeant.*” De Pœnitentia, p. 48.

Page 130, note (<sup>13</sup>).

Penitence is thus defined in the Augsbourg Confession: “*Constat autem pœnitentia (hoc est, conversio*  
“*impii*, ed. 1540.) *proprie* his duabus partibus: altera  
“*est contritio*, seu terrores incussi conscientię agnito  
“*peccato*: (in quibus et iram Dei agnoscimus, et do-  
“*lemus nos peccasse*, et *peccata detestamur et fugimus*,  
“*sicut Joel concionatur*, ‘*Scindite corda vestra, et non*  
“*vestimenta vestra, et convertimini ad Dominum Deum*  
“*vestrum,*’ &c. ed. 1540.) altera est *fides*, quæ conci-  
“*pitur ex Evangelio seu absolutione*, et credit propter  
“*Christum* (certo, ed. 1540.) *remitti peccata, consola-*  
“*tur conscientiam, et ex terroribus liberat*; (de qua  
“*fide Paulus loquitur, cum ait*, ‘*Justificati fide, pa-*  
“*cem habemus,*’ ed. 1540). Deinde *sequi debent bona*  
“*opera*, quæ sunt fructus pœnitentię. (Deinde sequi  
“*debent boni fructus pœnitentię, hoc est, obedientia*  
“*erga Deum, juxta illud*, ‘*Debitor es sumus non car-*  
“*ni, ut secundum carnem vivamus. Si enim secun-*  
“*dum carnem vivetis, moriemini; sed si Spiritu actiones*  
“*corporis mortificabitis, vivetis,*’ ed. 1540.)” Art. 11.

But when the Lutherans described penitence as consisting only of contrition and faith, it should be observed, that they contemplated it according to its *proper* signification, (“*Constat autem pœnitentia proprie,*”) solely as the conversion of a sinner, as the act of his returning from vice to virtue, and “from the power  
“of Satan unto God;” and that with contrition and faith they expressly maintained the necessary coexistence of every genuine principle of holiness. “*Nec*  
“*aliud volunt nostri, cum dicunt*, ‘*sola fide iustifica-*  
“*mur,*’ quam quod jam dixi, *gratis fide propter Chris-*  
“*tum consequimur remissionem peccatorum, non prop-*  
“*ter*

“ter nostram dignitatem. Nec excludit particula *so-*  
*la*, *contritionem aut cæteras virtutes, ne adsint*, sed nē-  
 gat eas esse *causas* reconciliationis, et transfert *cau-*  
*sam in solum Christum.*” Loci Theolog. de Vocab.  
 Gratiae, p. 240. ed. 1595. “Quid autem planius et  
 simplicius dici potest hac voce? Etiam si existere in  
 nobis pœnitentiam oportet, tamen statuendum esse  
 quod non propter nostras virtutes, sed propter Fi-  
 lium Dei Mediatorem, recipiamur, et placeamus Deo.  
 Quid hæc vox habet absurdi? *Postulat, ut adsint vir-*  
*tutes*, et tamen *causam* reconciliationis transfert in  
*Christum*, tribuit Christo debitum honorem, et mon-  
 strat piis firmam consolationem.” Ibid. de Vocab.  
 Gratiae, p. 243. See also p. 284, 434, and 281. “De  
 magna re disputamus, *de honore Christi*, et unde pe-  
 tant *bonæ mentes* certam et firmam consolationem.  
 Utrum fiducia collocanda sit *in Christum*, an *in opera*  
*nostra*. Quod si in opera nostra collocanda sit, de-  
 trahitur Christi honos Mediatoris et Propitiatoris.”  
 Apologia Confess. de dilect. et implet. Legis, p. 14.

Their object in introducing the term *faith* into the definition of penitence, instead of arising, as some have conceived, from a propensity to make religion a sort of ecstatical reverie, and to gratify the imagination at the expence of the judgment, was simply to impress the necessity of trusting in divine forgiveness upon a Christian principle; a principle, which the Church of Rome seemed totally to have discarded. “Quod aliter  
 Monachi scripserunt, eo fit, quia non discernebant  
 Legem et Evangelium, et de justificatione loquuntur  
 philosophico more; prorsus ut Plato vel Aristoteles co-  
 gitat, Achillem esse fortem virum, quia habet hanc  
 virtutem, et afflatum quendam divinum, ita hi di-  
 cunt, Paulum justum esse propter suas virtutes, et af-  
 flatum divinum, nihil addunt de Mediatore, de promif-  
 sionibus

“*sonibus seu Evangelio, et de fide, seu fiducia Mediatoris*; imo jubent *dubitare de reconciliatione*, hoc est, *delere Evangelium et promissionem, et sepelire Christum.* Quoties igitur venit in mentem hujus controversiæ refer oculos ad hunc scopum. Cum reipsa et vere hoc dicatur, necessariam esse pœnitentiam, et tamen nos propter Filium Dei habere remissionem, placere, et exaudiri, tribuam Filio Dei suum honorem, et hac fide seu fiducia promissæ misericordiæ Deum invocabo.” Loci Theolog. de argum. Adversariorum, p. 282.

But while they argued for the necessity of trusting in God’s free mercy through Christ, and not in our own merits, for the remission of sin, it was very far from their intention to represent that faith or trust, as an act or quality of the mind, justifying us, by its own nature, in the sight of God. The sole point at issue was to determine the meritorious cause of justification in the eye of Heaven; and this they were anxious to attribute neither to faith, nor to any other virtue. “*Concedo in fiducia inesse dilectionem, et hanc virtutem et plerasque alias adesse oportere*; sed cum dicimus, ‘*Fiducia sumus justi*,’ non intelligatur nos *propter virtutis istius dignitatem*, sed per misericordiam recipi propter Mediatorem, quam tamen oportet fide apprehendi.” Loci Theolog. de argum. Advers. p. 284. “Fide sumus justi, id est, per misericordiam propter Christum sumus justi; non quia *fides sit virtus, quæ mereatur remissionem sua dignitate.* Quod vero additur, ‘*fides est opus*,’ concedendum est. Est enim opus, ut dilectio, patientia, castitas.” Ibid. p. 286. It seems therefore certain, that the justifying efficacy, which their adversaries attributed to works, they transferred not to faith, but to the object of it; an act of the mind only requisite, that the individual may himself apply

apply his justification to his own conscience, when truly penitent, instead of having it applied for him, (particularly in the sacrifices of the Mass,) by a superstitious Priest, in a superstitious Sacrament. "Inde factum est, quod docent *ex opere operato*, ut loquuntur, "mereri" (viz. Missam) "gratiam, et tollere peccata vivorum et mortuorum. Hæc opinio, quantopere distet a Scripturis, ac gloriam passionis Christi lædat, "Serenissima Regia Majestas vestra facillime judicabit. "Si enim hoc verum est, quod Missa *pro aliis applicari* "potest, quod peccata tollit, et prodest tam vivis quam "mortuis, sequitur, *justificationem ex opere Missarum* "contingere, *non ex fide*; verum hoc omnino Scripturæ repugnat, quæ tradit, nos gratis propter Christum per fidem justificari, ac peccata nobis condonari, "et in gratiam nos recipi, atque ita *non alieno opere*, "sed *propria fide*, propter Christum *singulos* justos fieri; at illi docent *alienum* opus pro remittendis peccatis *alteri*." Letter of the German Ambassadors to Henry VIII. Burnet, vol. i. p. 335. Records.

Page 130, note (<sup>14</sup>).

The division of penitence into its respective parts is thus noticed in the Apology of the Augsbourg Confession: "Constituimus *duas* partes pœnitentiæ, videlicet, contritionem et fidem. Si quis volet addere *tertiam*, videlicet, dignos fructus pœnitentiæ, hoc est, *mutationem totius vitæ et morum in melius, non refragabimur*." De Pœnit. p. 40. Indeed, it is there sometimes contemplated as necessarily comprehending its fruits; "Agite pœnitentiam, certe loquitur de *tota* pœnitentia, de *tota* novitate vitæ, et *fructibus*." De Pœnit. p. 48. "Verum est enim quod in doctrina pœnitentiæ *requiruntur opera*, quia certe nova vita requiritur." Responsio ad arg. Adversar. p. 23. In the Loci Theologici it is defined much after the same manner:

manner: "Voco pœnitentiam, ut in Ecclesia loquimur, conversionem ad Deum, et hujus conversionis partes seu diversos motus, dicendi causa, discerno. Dico partes esse contritionem et fidem. Has necessario sequi debet nova obedientia, quam si quis vult nominare tertiam partem, non repugno." Loci Theolog. de Pœnit. p. 415. But, in the Saxon Confession, the third part is expressly included: "Docendi causa distribuimus conversionem, vel pœnitentiam, in tria membra; in contritionem, fidem, et novam obedientiam. Nam has res complectitur vera conversio, ut vox divina et vera Ecclesiæ experientia ostendunt. Nec tamen de modis loquendi, aut numero partium, contentiones movemus, sed res necessarias in conspectu omnibus esse volumus. Et maxime necessarium est Ecclesiæ extare veram doctrinam planam, maxime perspicuam, de tota conversione." Art. de Pœnitent, In conformity likewise with this idea, Melancthon observes, "Sæpe Scriptura pœnitentiam vocat totam conversionem cum fructibus." Disput. Oper. Luther. vol. i. p. 450. It appears therefore, that when the Lutherans described penitence merely as comprising what the Sacrament of it, according to the Church of Rome, was supposed to effect, they viewed it as consisting only of *contrition and faith*; but that, when they considered it as an entire conversion both of the heart and *life*, they included in it *actual obedience*.

Page 131, note (<sup>15</sup>).

Upon the exercise of good works, as requisite to preserve the favour of God, and obtain the rewards of Heaven, the Augsbourg Confession speaks without reserve: "De hac obedientia etiam docemus, eos, qui admittunt peccata mortalia, non esse justos, quia Deus requirit hanc obedientiam, ut resistamus vitiosis affectibus. Qui autem non repugnant, sed obtempe-

“*rant eis contra conscientiam, hi sunt iniusti, et neque*  
 “*Spiritum Sanctum, neque fidem, id est, fiduciam*  
 “*miseriordiæ, retinent. Nam in his, qui delectantur*  
 “*peccatis, nec agunt pœnitentiam, ne potest quidem*  
 “*fiducia existere, quæ quærat remissionem peccato-*  
 “*rum. . . . Et veræ virtutes sine ulla dubitatione sunt*  
 “*dona Dei. . . . Debet autem ad hæc dona accedere*  
 “*exercitatio nostra, quæ et conservat ea et meretur incre-*  
 “*mentum, juxta illud, ‘Habenti dabitur.’ Et Augus-*  
 “*tinus præclare dixit, ‘Dilectio meretur incrementum*  
 “*dilectionis,’ cum videlicet exercetur. Habent enim*  
 “*bona opera præmia, cum in hac vita, tum post hanc*  
 “*vitam in vita æterna.” Art. 20. de bonis operibus,*  
 ed. 1540.

But Luther, commenting on these words in St. Mat-  
 thew, “Et tunc reddet unicuique secundum opera sua,”  
 explained the point of future rewards more fully; ar-  
 guing, that neither external works, nor internal piety,  
 but a complete Christian obedience, will be the rule  
 of retribution at the day of judgment. “Quod est  
 “ratio in moralibus, hoc fides est in theologia, sicut in  
 “natura arbor est prior fructu. Quæri enim et hic  
 “potest, an fructus faciat arborem, vel arbor fructum.  
 “Hic respondebitur ex natura, nisi primum sit arbor  
 “habens suum succum, &c. non fiunt fructus. Ita in  
 “moralibus, nisi homo sit bonus habens succum suum,  
 “id est, rectam rationem, non sequuntur bona opera.  
 “Ita in theologia, nisi adsit succus et pinguedo olivæ,  
 “hoc est, *fides et cognitio Dei*, non fiunt opera fidelia.  
 “Stat ergo veritas, arborem sine fructu et ante fruc-  
 “tum esse bonam suo solo succo et natura. Stat veri-  
 “tas, moralem hominem esse bonum sine operibus, et  
 “ante opera, per solam rationem rectam. Stat veri-  
 “tas, Christianum esse justum sine caritatis operibus,  
 “et ante caritatem, per solam fidem. Quid sit ergo,  
 “quod



“ quod urgent opera et dicta de operibus, cum cogantur fateri, nullum opus esse posse, nisi prior sit efficiens seu operans sine opere, et *opus* necessario prærequirere *personam*, quæ ipsum faciat? Cur ergo ita pugnant contra nos, quod fidem sine operibus dicimus esse, et facere personam justam; postea sequi opera, quæ non faciant personam justam, sed fiant a persona justa: cum fateri cogantur id ita fieri tam in natura, quam in philosophia morali, seu lege? . . . .  
 “ Vitiosissimum igitur argumentum est; Deus reddet secundum opera, ergo opera justificant vel damnant. Et est vere fallacia compositionis et divisionis. Pessime enim dividunt, quæ composita sunt. Siquidem illud verbum *opera* est compositum, includens fidei, seu *rationem fidelem*, per quam fiunt opera, &c. At ipsi *dividunt* istud *compositum*, et *sola opera*, seu *partem compositi*, opponunt fidei, et *per opera volunt salvari*. Et ipse textus Evangelii hanc divisionem vitiosam non patitur, quia conjungit opera cum persona, et facit *tale compositum ex operante et operibus*, quod non sit dividendum. Non enim dicit, ‘Reddet cuilibet operi,’ sed sic dicit, ‘Reddet unicuique secundum opera sua.’ Unicuique inquit, id est, *qualis fuerit persona operans, talem accipiet mercedem*. Quare non opera, sed operans recipiet mercedem. Operans vero est, qui ante opus vel bonus vel malus est. Ergo argumentari ab opere ad operantem, est a parte ad totum argumentari. Sicut si argumenteris: Hoc animal habet duos pedes; ergo est homo, quia duo pedes sunt pars hominis, non totus homo.

“ Si ista subtiliora sunt, quam ut intelligi possint a vulgo, tunc manendum est in ista simplicitate, quod Scriptura de operibus et præmiis loquentes sunt regulæ, secundum quas tota vita agenda sit.” Opera, vol. v. p. 69.

*Page 132, note (16).*

Homily of the salvation of mankind.

*Page 132, note (17).*

The same. This Homily, to which the Article refers for a fuller explanation of the subject, is expressed in language remarkably clear and unphilosophical. The object of it is to point out, in opposition to the delusive doctrine of the Church of Rome, the true meritorious cause of justification, on which the returning penitent should fix his eye, who, by transgression, has lost that state of acceptance, which he before possessed, and consequently his sure title to eternal happiness. It commences therefore with stating, that justification consists in the forgiveness of sins, which nothing can deserve, except the sacrifice of Christ; a justification, received by infants in baptism, and recovered by adults through penitence. “*Insomuch that infants being baptized, and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God’s favour, and made his children, and inheritors of the kingdom of Heaven. And they, which in act or deed do sin after baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins, in such sort, that there remaineth not any spot of sin, that shall be imputed to their damnation.*” Thus baptism is the mean of admission into God’s favour in infancy, and penitence that of a reinstatement in it, if forfeited by crime, in maturer years, “*when we turn again to God unfeignedly.*” But with respect to the latter case, although penitence be the mean, it is not the merit, of reconciliation; for it is said, that we are “*justified by faith only,*” or, in other words, by Christ only, in whose atonement, as the basis of our justification, alone we trust. “*And yet that faith,*” it is added, “*doth not shut out repentance, hope, love,*  
“*dread,*

“dread, and the fear of God, *to be joined*” (that is, *requisite* to be joined) “in every man, that is justified, “but it shutteth them out from the *office*” (or the *meritorious agency*) “of justifying. So that although they “be *all present together* in him, that is justified, yet “they *justify* not all together;” (accomplish that to which nothing but *Christ’s sacrifice* is competent;) “neither doth faith shut out the justice of our good “works *necessarily* to be done *afterwards* of *duty* to- “wards God, (for we are *most bounden* to serve God in “doing good deeds, commanded by him in his holy “Scripture, all the days of our life,) but it excludeth “them, so that we may not do them to this intent, to “be *made just by doing of them*. For all the good works “that we can do, be *imperfect*, and therefore not able “to *deserve* our justification; but our justification doth “come *freely* by the mere mercy of God.” We here plainly perceive, that with faith the coexistence of repentance, hope, love, the dread and fear of God, is deemed *necessary* before we can be justified, and the performance of every good work *afterwards*, as qualifications, which we are required to possess, although *in point of merit* they contribute nothing toward our justification.

But that no mistake might arise upon this important subject, it is again explained more fully. “Nevertheless this sentence, that we be justified by faith only, “is not so meant of them,” (viz. the Fathers,) “that “the said justifying faith is *alone* in man *without* re- “pentance, hope, charity, dread and the fear of God “at any time and season. Nor when they say that we be “justified freely, they mean not that we *should* or *might* “afterward be idle, and that nothing should be required “on our parts afterward: neither mean they, that we “are so to be justified without good works, that we

“ should do no good works at all, like as shall be more  
 “ expressed at large hereafter. But this saying, that  
 “ we be justified by faith only, freely and without  
 “ works, is spoken for to take away clearly all *merit* of  
 “ our works, as being unable to *deserve* our justification  
 “ at God’s hands, and thereby most plainly to express  
 “ the *weakness* of man and the *goodness* of God, the  
 “ great *infirmity* of ourselves, and the *might and power* of  
 “ God, the *imperfection* of our own works, and the *most*  
 “ *abundant grace* of our Saviour Christ, and therefore  
 “ wholly to ascribe the *merit and deserving* of our justifi-  
 “ cation unto Christ only, and his most precious blood-  
 “ shedding.” Can words more evidently demonstrate,  
 that the great object of the Homily is to prove man  
 incapable of *deserving* his justification, because he can-  
 not by his own works “ *take away and purge his own*  
 “ *sins*, and *so* justify himself,” as it is subsequently ex-  
 pressed?

Let us not, however, suppose, that our Reformers  
 imagined faith, when contemplated in the light of a  
 mere mental quality, to be more capable of justifying,  
 than any other quality of the mind. For they re-  
 marked; “ The true understanding of this doctrine,  
 “ we be justified freely by faith without works; or that  
 “ we be justified by faith in Christ only, is not, that  
 “ this *our own act to believe in Christ*, or this our faith  
 “ in Christ, which is within us, doth justify us, and de-  
 “ serve our justification unto us; (for that were to  
 “ count ourselves to be justified by *some act or virtue*,  
 “ *that is within ourselves*;) but the true understanding  
 “ and meaning thereof is, that, although we hear God’s  
 “ word and believe it, although we have faith, hope,  
 “ charity, repentance, dread and fear of God, within  
 “ us, and do never so many works thereunto; yet we  
 “ must renounce the *merit* of all our said virtues, of  
 “ faith,

“faith, hope, charity, and all other virtues, and good  
 “deeds, which we either have done, shall do, or can  
 “do, as things that be far too *weak and insufficient and*  
 “*imperfect to deserve* the remission of our sins.” If  
 therefore it be asked, in what is our confidence to be  
 placed? the answer has been already given, and is  
 again added in expressions, which, at the same time,  
 manifestly point out the *conditional* nature of reconcili-  
 ation. “We must trust,” it is stated, “only in God’s  
 “mercy, and that sacrifice, which our High Priest and  
 “Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God, once offered  
 “upon the Cross, *to obtain thereby* God’s grace, and  
 “remission as well of original sin in baptism, as of all  
 “actual sin committed by us after our Baptism, *if we*  
 “*truly repent, and turn unfeignedly to him again.*” Is  
 it possible to doubt, that the terms of acceptance are  
 here understood in a *conditional* point of view, when  
 Christ is expressly asserted to have obtained the remis-  
 sion of actual sin after baptism only “*if,*” or upon the  
 condition that, “we truly repent, and turn unfeignedly  
 “to him again?” Indeed, that our Reformers solely in-  
 tended to exclude repentance and the conversion of the  
 heart from the contemplation of Omniscience, as meri-  
 torious causes, and not as necessary qualifications, the  
 whole tenor of the Homily evinces. All that they meant  
 by the phrase, “we are justified by faith in Christ only,”  
 (as they themselves explained it,) “is this; we put our  
 “faith in Christ, that we be justified by him only,  
 “that we be justified by God’s free mercy and the  
 “merits of our Saviour Christ only, and by no virtue or  
 “good works of our own, that is in us, or that we can  
 “be able to have, or to do, for to *deserve* the same;  
 “Christ himself only being *the cause meritorious* thereof.  
 “..... Nevertheless because faith doth directly send us  
 “to Christ for remission of our sins, and that by faith

“given us of God we *embrace* the promise of God’s  
 “mercy and of the remission of our sins, (which thing  
 “*none other* of our virtues or works *properly* doth,) *there-*  
 “*fore* the Scripture useth to say, that *faith without*  
 “works doth justify.”

In this Homily then, by way of contradistinction to the Church of Rome, which taught, that the “justificatio impij” of the Schools, or, as it was more usually termed, the justification of him, who lapses after baptism, depends upon human merit, as upon an efficient principle, our own Church maintains, that thus it is wholly and solely imputable to the merit of the Redeemer, and that it is received (for how, consistently with common sense, can it be otherwise received ?) by faith, but not received unconditionally, requiring a total conversion of the sinner, one accompanied by true repentance, and followed by actual amendment; not that ideal conversion of a more modern date, which proceeds, we know not whence, and tends, we care not whither.

*Page 133, note (18).*

Homily upon faith. The whole definition of this point, given in the Homily, is thus worded. “Another  
 “faith there is in Scripture, which is not (as the fore-  
 “said faith) idle, unfruitful, and dead, but worketh by  
 “charity, (as St. Paul declareth, Gal. v.) which as the  
 “other vain faith is called a dead faith, so may this be  
 “called a quick or lively faith. And this is not only  
 “the common belief of the Articles of our faith, but  
 “it is also a *sure trust and confidence* of the mercy of  
 “God through our Lord Jesus Christ, and a *steadfast*  
 “*hope* of all good things to be received at God’s hands,  
 “and that although we, through infirmity or tempta-  
 “tion of our guastly enemy, do fall from him by sin,  
 “yet” (*conditionally*) “if we return again to him by  
 “true

“ *true repentance*, that he will forgive and forget our  
 “ offences for his Son’s sake, our Saviour Jesus Christ,  
 “ and will make us inheritors with him of his ever-  
 “ lasting kingdom; and that in the mean time, until  
 “ that kingdom come, he will be our protector and  
 “ defender in all perils and dangers, whatsoever do  
 “ chance; and that though sometimes he doth send us  
 “ sharp adversity, yet that evermore he will be a loving  
 “ father unto us, correcting us for our sin, but not  
 “ withdrawing his mercy *finally* from us,” (which  
 otherwise he will do, as having made no decree to  
 the contrary,) “ *if we trust in him, and commit our-*  
 “ *selves wholly to him, hang only upon him, and call*  
 “ *upon him, ready to obey and serve him. This is the*  
 “ *true lively and unfeigned Christian faith.*” And  
 again, in a subsequent part of the same Homily: “ For  
 “ the very sure and lively Christian faith is, not only  
 “ to believe all things of God, which are contained in  
 “ holy Scripture, but also to have an earnest trust and  
 “ confidence in God, that he doth regard us, and that  
 “ he is careful over us, as the father is over the child,  
 “ whom he doth love, and that he will be merciful  
 “ unto us for his only Son’s sake, and that we have  
 “ our Saviour Christ our perpetual Advocate and Prince,  
 “ in whose only merits, oblation, and suffering, we do  
 “ trust, that our offences be continually washed and  
 “ purged, *whensoever we (repenting truly) do return to*  
 “ *him with our whole heart, steadfastly determining with*  
 “ *ourselves through his grace to obey and serve him in*  
 “ *keeping his comandments*, and never to turn back again  
 “ to sin. *Such is the true faith, which the Scripture*  
 “ *doth so much commend.*”

Page 134, note (<sup>19</sup>).

Homily of good works. This passage is immedi-  
 ately succeeded by the following. “ First you must  
 “ have

“ have an *assured faith in God*, and give yourselves  
 “ wholly unto him, love him in prosperity and adver-  
 “ sity, and dread to offend him evermore. Then for  
 “ his sake love *all* men, friends and foes, because they  
 “ be his *creation and image*, and *redeemed by Christ*, as  
 “ *ye are.*” Then after a short paraphrase upon the De-  
 calogue, the homily thus concludes, “ And travailing  
 “ continually, during this life, thus in keeping the  
 “ commandments of God, (wherein standeth the pure,  
 “ principal, and right honour of God, and which,  
 “ wrought in faith, God hath ordained to be *the right*  
 “ *trade and path-way unto heaven,*) you shall not fail,  
 “ as Christ hath promised, to come to that blessed and  
 “ everlasting life, where you shall live in glory and joy  
 “ with God for ever.”

Our Liturgy likewise abounds with declarations re-  
 specting the necessity of repentance, no less than of  
 faith, in order to obtain the forgiveness of our sins.  
 These particularly occur in the exhortation, confession,  
 and absolution of our daily Prayer, and also in the ex-  
 hortation and absolution of our Communion-service.  
 In the collect indeed for Ash Wednesday perfect remis-  
 sion and forgiveness is ascribed to repentance alone.  
 “ Almighty and everlasting God, who hatest nothing  
 “ that thou hast made, and dost *forgive* the sins of all  
 “ them that be *penitent*, create and make in us *new and*  
 “ *contrite hearts*, that we worthily lamenting our sins,  
 “ and acknowledging our wretchedness, may obtain of  
 “ thee, the God of all mercy, *perfect remission and for-*  
 “ *giveness.*” And so studious were our Reformers of  
 inculcating this doctrine on every proper occasion, that,  
 where they found it not in the forms of the Romish  
 Church, they introduced it, as in the absolution of the  
 Communion-service; “ Misereatur vestri omnipotens  
 “ Deus, et dimittat vobis omnia peccata vestra, liberet  
 “ vos



“ vos ab omni malo, conservet et confirmet in bono,  
 “ et ad vitam perducatur æternam.” Breviar. Præf. Mis-  
 sæ. “ Almighty God, *our heavenly Father, who of his*  
 “ *great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all*  
 “ *them, that with hearty repentance and true faith turn*  
 “ *unto him,* have mercy upon you, pardon and deliver  
 “ you from all your sins, confirm and strengthen you  
 “ in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life.”

Page 135, note (20).

“ When men hear in the Scriptures so high com-  
 “ mendations of faith, that it maketh us to please  
 “ God, to live with God, and to be the children of  
 “ God, if then they fancy, that they be set at liberty  
 “ from doing all good works, and may live as they  
 “ list, *they trifle with God, and deceive themselves.*”  
 Homily of faith. “ If these fruits do not follow,”  
 the same Homily towards the end repeats, “ we  
 “ do but *mock God, deceive ourselves,* and also other  
 “ men.” And in another Homily the means of pro-  
 viding against the fear of death, to obtain and preserve  
 a hope full of immortality, are thus described: “ Let  
 “ us *repent our sins, amend our lives, trust in his mercy*  
 “ *and satisfaction,* and death can neither take him  
 “ from us, nor us from him.” Homily against the fear  
 of death. Nor did our Reformers, who had suffi-  
 ciently stated the meritorious cause of salvation in  
 the Homilies, on other occasions scruple to consider  
 Christian piety as entitled to *rewards*. “ That they,  
 “ plenteously bringing forth the fruits of good works,  
 “ may of thee be plenteously *rewarded.*” Collect.  
 25th Sunday after Trinity. And likewise in our Ar-  
 ticles themselves: “ To the end that man, accord-  
 “ ing as either righteously or wickedly he hath passed  
 “ this life, may *according to his works* receive *rewards*  
 “ or punishments.” Art. 39. ed. 1553.

With

With the doctrine of the Church of England in Edward's reign, perfectly accorded that, which had been established in the preceding. This will appear by referring to the Articles of Religion, published by the King and Clergy in the year 1536, which served as a basis for the subsequent Reformation. There justification is thus explained: "As touching the order and  
 " cause of our justification, we will, that all bishops  
 " and preachers shall instruct and teach our people,  
 " committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that  
 " this word justification signifieth remission of our sins,  
 " and our acceptation or reconciliation into the grace  
 " and favour of God, that is to say, our perfect renovation in Christ. Item, that *sinners* attain this justification by *contrition and faith, joined with charity*,  
 " after such sort and manner as we before mentioned  
 " and declared, not as though our contrition or faith,  
 " or any works proceeding thereof, can worthily *merit*  
 " or *deserve* to attain the said justification; for the only  
 " mercy and grace of the Father, promised freely unto  
 " us for his Son's sake Jesus Christ, and the merits of  
 " his blood and passion, be *the only sufficient and worthy causes* thereof; and yet that notwithstanding to  
 " the attaining of the said justification, God requireth  
 " to be in us *not only inward contrition, perfect faith*  
 " *and charity, certain hope and confidence, with all other*  
 " *spiritual graces and motions*, which, as we said before, *must necessarily concur* in remission of our sins,  
 " that is to say, our justification; but also he requireth and commandeth us, that, *after* we be justified,  
 " we must also have good *works* of charity, and obedience towards God, in the observing and fulfilling  
 " *outwardly* of his laws and commandments; for, although *acceptation* to everlasting life be conjoined  
 " with justification, yet our good works be *necessarily*  
 " *required*,

“ *required* to the *attainment* of everlasting life ; and we  
 “ being justified, be *necessarily bound*, and it is our *ne-*  
 “ *cessary duty*, to do good works.” Art. Justif. These  
 Articles, it should be observed, were of such authority  
 at the period of their publication, that they were or-  
 dered to be plainly and distinctly read, upon holydays,  
 in every Cathedral and Parochial Church throughout  
 the kingdom. See Burnet, *Histor. Reform.* vol. i.  
 p. 362. Addenda.

The sentiments of Cranmer, Latimer, and Hooper,  
 upon the same subject, seem strongly to confirm the  
 tendency of the explanation, which has been given.  
 Cranmer argued, that charity is no less necessary to  
 justification, than faith, and that everlasting life  
 through Christ is the reward of obedience. “ Al-  
 “ though all that be justified must *of necessity* have cha-  
 “ *rity*, as well as *faith*, yet neither faith nor charity be  
 “ the worthiness or merits of our justification.” Bur-  
 net, *Histor. Reform.* vol. i. p. 288. “ Wherefore,  
 “ good children, labour with all diligence and study,  
 “ that when Christ shall come again to judge the world,  
 “ he may find you *holy and obedient*. For then he will  
 “ *reward you with everlasting life*.” Catech. p. 131. La-  
 timer repeatedly impressed the necessity of repentance  
 and amendment to obtain pardon here, and eternal hap-  
 piness hereafter : “ May we rise from sin ? Yes, that  
 “ we may ; for God hath provided a remedy for us.  
 “ What is that ? Forsooth *penance*. We must have the  
 “ staff of penance, and rise up withal.” Sermons, p.  
 227. “ Almighty God set out his will by Moses and  
 “ his Prophets, and this will is contained in *certain*  
 “ *laws*, which laws God commandeth that we should  
 “ keep ever before our eyes, and look upon them as  
 “ in a glass, and so learn to order our lives according  
 “ unto the same. And in case that a man *swerve* from  
 “ the

“ the same, and so fall into the danger of damnation,  
 “ God revealed further his will, how to *remedy* the  
 “ matter ; namely, by *repentance* and *faith*. So that  
 “ whosoever, from the bottom of his heart, is *sorry* for  
 “ his sins, and *studieth to leave them*, and *live uprightly*,  
 “ and *then* believeth in our Saviour, confessing, that he  
 “ came into this world to make amends for our sins ;  
 “ this man or woman shall not perish, but have for-  
 “ giveness of sins, and so obtain everlasting life.” p.  
 142. “ But if we will *leave our sins and wickedness*,  
 “ and *study to live according unto his will and command-*  
 “ *ments*, no doubt he will fulfil his promises, which he  
 “ hath made unto us, of everlasting life. . . . . This is  
 “ now a comfortable thing, and a great promise, which  
 “ God maketh *to the whole world*. . . . . It is not his  
 “ *pleasure*, when we be *damned*. . . . . Now therefore,  
 “ *if* we will follow him, and *leave our wicked living*,  
 “ *convert and turn ourselves unto him*, be *sorry for that*  
 “ *which is past*, and *intend to amend our life now for-*  
 “ *ward* ; *if* we do so, no doubt we shall live with him  
 “ everlastingly, world without end.” p. 247. “ And  
 “ this Parliament will be sufficient for all realms of the  
 “ whole world, which is *the last day*. Where our Sa-  
 “ viour himself will bear the rule, there shall be no-  
 “ thing done amiss, I warrant you ; but every one, as  
 “ he hath *deserved*, so he shall have. *The wicked shall*  
 “ *have hell : the good shall possess heaven*.” p. 139.

Nor were Hooper's tenets of a different description.  
 In a small tract, published in 1547, (the same year  
 with our Homilies,) he observed ; “ Our new *Evan-*  
 “ *gelists* have another opinion. They *dream* of faith  
 “ that justifieth, the which neither *repentance precedeth*,  
 “ *neither honesty of life followeth*, which shall be to them  
 “ double damnation, if they amend not.” A Declara-  
 tion of Christ and his Office, chap. 4. “ The Scripture  
 “ is

“ is more diligent and more ample in teaching the  
 “ Christian justified man *the obedience unto God, and*  
 “ *virtuous life*, than it is to shew us *our salvation in*  
 “ *Christ*; for this purpose only, that we should not by  
 “ our licentious liberty receive the grace of God in  
 “ vain. . . . The science of the Scripture *is practive,*  
 “ *and not speculative*. It requireth a *doer*, and not a  
 “ *speaker only*. There be many *dissemble faith*, and  
 “ have a certain *shew of religion*, when in the inward  
 “ man is no faith at all. Let every man, therefore,  
 “ search his own conscience, with what faith he is en-  
 “ dued, and remember that Christ said, it is a straight  
 “ and narrow way, that leadeth to life, and but a few  
 “ walk therein. Therefore our only remedy is to  
 “ pray for grace, and *amend*.” Chap. 13. And in  
 another work of the year 1549, he thus justifies the  
 ways of God to man: “ Understand, that his justice  
 “ extendeth to two divers ends; the one is, that *he*  
 “ *would all men to be saved*; the other end, *to give*  
 “ *every man according to his acts*. To obtain the first  
 “ end of his justice, as many as be *not utterly wicked,*  
 “ *and may be holpen*, partly with threatenings, and  
 “ partly with promises, *he allureth and provoketh them*  
 “ *unto amendment of life*. The other part of his justice  
 “ *rewardeth the obedience of the good, and punisheth the*  
 “ *inobedience and contempt of the ill*.” Declaration of  
 the Ten Commandments, Preface.

Our Reformers indeed frequently reprobated, in the  
 strongest language, the idea of a justification by *our*  
*own* works. But how harsh soever may have been  
 their censures upon this head, we are not surpris'd at  
 their zeal, when we turn to the Injunctions of Ridley,  
 in the year 1550; for there we perceive, from the va-  
 rious superstitions enumerated with the proscribed  
 doctrine, what those works of *our own* properly were,  
 which

which they principally kept in view, when they expressed themselves on the occasion with so much severity. “Item, that none maintain Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, the six Articles, Bedrowls, Images, Reliques, Rubrick Primers with invocation of Saints, *Justification of man by his own works*, Holy bread, Palms, Ashes, Candles, Sepulchre Paschal, Creeping to the Cross, Hallowing of the fire or altar, or any such-like abuses and superstitions, now taken away by the King’s Grace’s most godly proceedings.” Burnet, vol. ii. p. 206. Records.

---

# NOTES

## ON SERMON VII.

Page 138, note (¹).

“SUNT quidem in divinis literis adyta quædam, in  
“quæ Deus noluit nos altius penetrare, et si penetrare  
“conemur, quo fuerimus altius ingressi, hoc magis ac  
“magis caligamus, quo vel sic agnosceremus et divinæ  
“sapientiæ majestatem impervestigabilem, et humanæ  
“mentis imbecillitatem. Quemadmodum de specu  
“quodam Coricio narrat Pomponius Mela, qui primum  
“jucunda quadam amœnitate allectat, ac ducit ad se,  
“donec altius atque altius ingressos tandem horror  
“quidam, ac majestas numinis illic inhabitantis submo-  
“veat.” Diatribe Erasmi, p. 5. ed. 1525. This pas-  
sage was particularly admired by Henry VIII. as ap-  
pears from a letter of Vives to Erasmus: “Regi est heri  
“tuus liber redditus de libero Arbitrio; ex quo inter fa-  
“cra legit pagellas aliquot, et ostendit sibi *perplacere*; ait  
“se perlecturum; indicavit mihi locum, *quo dicit se im-  
“penſe delectatum*, quum deterres homines *ab immodica  
“perſcrutatione adytorum divinæ illius majestatis*.” Anno  
1525. Epistolæ Melancthi. Mori et Vivis Auctar. Epist.  
p. 104.

Page 139, note (²).

De Deo incognito, hoc est, non revelato et pate-  
facto per verbum, scire aliquid, quid sit, quid faciat,  
quid *velit*, ad me non pertinet. Hoc autem ad me per-  
tinet, ut sciam, quid præceperit, quid promiserit, quid

comminatus sit. Hæc cum meditaris studiose, invenis Deum. Imo ipse te colligit in suum gremium, ex quo si excidas, hoc est, si aliquid *ultra illa, quæ verbo revelata sunt, præsumis scire*, ruis in abyssos inferni.

Recte igitur ille Heremita monuit. “Si videris,” inquit, “juvenem Monachum ascendere ad cælum, et “jam quasi ponere alterum pedem in cælum, *retrabe* “eum statim; si enim ambos ibi posuerit pedes, *non in* “*cælo, sed in inferno* se esse videbit.” Hæc vox aliud nihil monet, quam ut *moderemur curiositatem*, et maneamus intra certos limites præfixos a Deo. Non enim in nubibus, sed in terra, voluit nos ingredi. Opera Lutheri, vol. vi. p. 204. *Perniciosa et pestilens cogitatio est de quare*, ac certum affert interitum, præsertim cum ascendimus altius, et *de prædestinatione volumus philosophari*. Ibid. p. 204.

Page 139, note (3).

See Serm. II. note 18. To the opposition which Calvin encountered, upon this subject, he himself thus alluded, at even a later period. “*Multos doctrinæ meæ* “*esse adversarios neque ignoro, neque miror; quia no-* “*vum non est Christo, sub cujus auspiciis milito, mul-* “*tos blaterones obstrepere: hoc tantum nomine doleo,* “*quod per latus meum configitur sacra illa æternaque* “*Dei veritas, quam reverenter a toto mundo suspici ado-* “*rarique decebat. . . . Nulli tamen improborum viru-* “*lenti morsus unquam efficient, ut ejus me doctrinæ* “*pœniteat, quam a Deo auctore profectam esse certo mi-* “*hi constat. Nec tam male in tot, quibus me Deus* “*exercuit, certaminibus profeci, ut ad futes vestros cre-* “*pitus adhuc expavescam.*” Opuscula, p. 1011.

Whether indeed he always maintained the doctrine of predestination according to the sense, in which his Institute explains it, may perhaps be doubted; at least, if he so held it in 1535, he certainly adopted a very singular



singular mode to propagate it. For in the preface to a French translation of the New Testament (one of his earliest publications) he then expressed himself upon the point in a style, which cannot, without a forced construction, be completely reconciled to his system, and which he carefully avoided in his subsequent productions. “Mediator ille D. N. Jesus Christus erat unus  
 “verus, æternus, Dei Filius, quem missurus erat Pater  
 “in mundum, ut *omnes* ex horrenda dispersione et vastitate *colligeret* . . . . Tandem igitur, ubi adfuit plenum illud tempus ac dies a Domino præordinata, adstitit coram Messias ille tot retro sæculis exoptatissimus; atque idem illa omnia cumulate præstitit, quæ erat *ad omnium redemptionem* necessaria. Neque vero intra unum Israëlém tantum illud beneficium stetit, cum potius *ad universum humanum genus* usque porrigendum esset; quia per unum Christum *universum humanum genus* reconciliandum erat Deo, uti hic novi fœderis tabulis continetur, et amplissime demonstratur . . . . Ad istam hæreditatem vocamur *omnes sine personarum acceptione*, masculi, fœminæ, summi; infimi, servi, magistri, discipuli, doctores, idiotæ, Judæi, Græci, Galli, Romani. *Nemo hinc excluditur*, qui modo Christum, qualis offertur a Patre in salutem *omnium*, admittat, et admissum complectatur.” Epistolæ, p. 395, 6, 7. ed. 1575.

If it be said, that these expressions, unambiguous as they appear, may notwithstanding be interpreted as only referring to God’s universal offer of salvation, it may be observed in reply, that they are not so explained in the preface itself, and that, occurring in one of his first works, they certainly conveyed no such limited idea to the reader of that day, unprovided with the master-key of the Calvinistical theory. Nor can those, who contend for an interpretation of this kind,

deny, that at least they *seem* to countenance an opinion, which Calvin afterwards opposed.

But, in whatsoever sense he wished them to be understood, it must be admitted, that he sometimes adapted the style of others, who had a very different object in view, to his own peculiar opinions. And hence, from the want of a due discrimination, the sentiments of his contemporaries, opposite in their natural tendency, are often improperly forced into the vortex of Calvinism. Systematizing was his darling propensity, and the ambition of being distinguished as a leader in reform his predominant passion; in the arrangements of the former he never felt a doubt, or found a difficulty; and in the pursuits of the latter he displayed an equal degree of perseverance and ardour. Thus in the doctrine of the Eucharist, it is well known, that he laboured to acquire celebrity, and conciliate followers, by maintaining a kind of middle sacramental presence between the corporeal of the Lutherans, and the mere spiritual of the Zuinglians, expressing himself in language, which, partly derived from one, and partly from the other, verged towards neither extreme, but which, by his singular talent at perspicuous combination, he applied (and not without success) to his own particular purpose. Nor was he less solicitous to press into his service a foreign phraseology upon the subject more immediately before me; a subject, on his theory of which he not a little prided himself, and seemed contented to stake his reputation. He perceived that the Lutherans, strongly reprobating every discussion upon the decrees of a Deity unrevealed to us, founded predestination solely on a scriptural basis, contending for a divine will, which is seriously, not fictitiously, disposed to save all men, and predetermined to save all, who become and continue sincere Christians.

Zuingle

Zuingle indeed had reasoned from a different principle; and, although persuaded, that God's mercies in Christ were liberally bestowed on all without distinction, on infants who commit not actual crime, and on the Heathen as well as the Christian world, he nevertheless was a *Necessitarian* in the strictest sense of the expression, referring events of every kind to an uncontrollable and absolute predetermination. Zuingle however died in 1531, before the youth of Calvin permitted him to assume the character of a Reformer; who found Bullinger then at the head of the Zuinglian Church, not only applauding, but adopting the moderation of the Lutherans; and plainly (to use the phrase of Turretin) *Melanchthonizing* ("Pour Bullinger, on n'avoit pas tort de dire, qu'il *Melanchthonisoit*." *Bibliothèque Germanique*, vol. xiii. p. 100.) But the doctrine alluded to, it may be imagined, was of a species too limited and unphilosophical for one of his enterprising turn of mind, who never met with an obstacle which he attempted not instantly to surmount. Disregarding therefore the sober restrictions of the times, he gave loose to the most unbounded speculation; yet, anxious by all means to win over all to his opinion, he studiously laboured to preserve, on some popular points, a verbal conformity with the Lutherans. With them in words he taught the universality of God's good will; but it was an universality, which he extended only to the *offer* of salvation, conceiving the reprobate to be precluded from the reception of that offer by the secret decree of an immutable Deity. The striking feature of *their* system was an *election in Christ*, by which they meant an election as Christians. This also in words he inculcated: *his* idea however of an election in Christ was totally different from *theirs*; for he held it to be the previous election of certain favourites by an irrelative will of God, whom, and, whom alone, Christ

was subsequently appointed to save. But his ingenuity was such in adapting the terms borrowed from another source to his own theory, that some erroneously conceive them to have been thus originally used by the Lutherans themselves. Hence therefore much confusion has arisen in the attempt of properly discriminating between the various sentiments of Protestants upon this question, at the period under consideration; all have been regarded as formed upon the model, which Calvin exhibited, at least by writers who have contemplated him as the greatest Reformer of his age, but who have forgotten, that, although they chose to esteem him the greatest, they could not represent him as the first in point of time, and that his title to preeminence in the common estimation of his contemporaries was then far from being acknowledged.

Thus has the doctrine maintained by the founders of our own Church been supposed to be of this description. But to prove, that, when they spoke in the language of the Lutherans, they meant to convey the sense of Calvin, it seems requisite to shew, that they approved of his peculiar system of predestination in other respects; the contrary of which was, in truth, the case. Nor, according to his own account, was his influence in this kingdom even at a later date considerable; for in a letter, which he addressed to the English exiles at Frankfort in the reign of Mary, he admitted, that our countrymen attached but little credit to his name, or weight to his opinion. Discord existed among them upon the subject of our Liturgy. After giving them some very sensible and seasonable advice upon the occasion, he added; "*Sed ego frustra ad eos sermo-*  
"*nem converto, qui forte non tantum mihi tribuunt,*  
"*ut consilium a tali auctore profectum admittere dignen-*  
"*tur.*" Epist. p. 158.

Page 141, note (\*).

The term *præsciti*, in the Scholastical acceptation of it, was synonymous with *reprobati*, and as such opposed to that of *prædestinati*. "*Præscientia est futurorum præcognitio, tam bonorum, quam malorum; appropriatur tamen reprobationi. Unde reprobati appropriate dicuntur præsciti; quia reprobatio ultra præscientiam non addit talem rationem dignitatis, sicut prædestinatio; sic et nomen animalis appropriatur irrationalibus animalibus, licet sit commune tam rationalibus, quam irrationalibus.*" Nic. de Orb. lib. i. dist. 41. "*Reprobatio opponitur approbationi.*" Aquina. lib. i. dist. 40. quæst. 4. art. 1.

Calvin's sentiments upon Reprobation are too plainly expressed to be mistaken, and too broadly marked to be confused with those of the Schools. "*Corruit ergo frivolum illud effugium, quod de præscientia Scholastici habent. Neque enim prævideri ruinam impiorum a Domino Paulus tradit, sed ejus consilio et voluntate ordinari, quemadmodum et Solomo docet, non modo præcognitum fuisse impiorum interitum, sed impios ipsos fuisse destinato creatos, ut perirent.*" In Rom. cap. ix. ver. 19. "*Hic abstinerebo a dissensione, ad quam fere scriptores ecclesiastici recurrunt, non impedire Dei præscientiam, quo minus homo peccator reputetur, quandoquidem illius mala, non sua, Deus prævideat. Non enim hic subsisteret cavillatio. . . . Ecce, quum rerum omnium dispositio in manu Dei sit, quum penes ipsum resideat salutis ac mortis arbitrium, consilio utique suo ita ordinat, ut inter homines ita nascantur, ab utero certæ morti devoti, qui suo exitio ipse nomen glorificent. Si quis causetur nullam eis inferri necessitatem ex Dei providentia, sed potius ea conditione ab ipso esse creatos, quoniam futuram eorum pravitatem prævide-*

“rit ; neque nihil dicit, neque totum. Solent quidem  
 “interdum hac solutione uti veteres, sed quasi dubi-  
 “tanter. *Scholastici vero in ea quiescunt, ac si nihil*  
 “*contra opponi posset.* . . . . Sed quum non alia ratione,  
 “quæ futura sunt, prævideat, nisi quia, ita ut fierent,  
 “*decrevit, frustra de præscientia* lis movetur, ubi con-  
 “stat *ordinatione* potius, et *nutu* omnia evenire.” Instit.  
 tutio, lib. iii. cap. 23. sect. 6.

Indeed he freely confesses, that his doctrine, as well  
 of election as of reprobation, runs counter not only to  
 the common opinion, but to that of celebrated writers,  
 in all ages : “Vulgo existimant Deum, prout cujusque  
 “*merita* fore prævidet, ita inter homines discernere ;  
 “quos ergo sua gratia fore non *indignos* præcognoscit,  
 “eos in filiorum locum cooptare ; quorum ingenia *ad*  
 “*malitiam et impietatem propensura* dispicit, eos mortis  
 “damnationi devovere. Sic, *interposito præscientiæ ve-*  
 “*lo*, electionem non modo obscurant, sed originem  
 “*aliunde* habere fingunt. Neque hæc vulgo recepta  
 “*opinio solius vulgi* est ; habuit enim  *sæculis omnibus*  
 “*magnos auctores*. Quod ingenue fateor, ne quis cau-  
 “sæ nostræ magnopere obfuturum confidat, si *eorum*  
 “*nomina contra opponantur*. Certior est enim hic  
 “Dei veritas, quam ut concutiat, clarior, quam ut  
 “obruatur, *hominum auctoritate*.” Instit. lib. iii. cap.  
 22. sect. 1. It should, however, be remarked, that  
 the great names, to which he alludes, are not those  
 of the Scholastics alone, but likewise of the Fathers,  
 for he not only attempts to refute the subtilty of  
 Aquinas, (“Thomæ argutiam, . . . . Thomæ argutio-  
 “*iam*,” sect. 9.) but admits the following to be the  
 received sentiments of Ambrose, Origen, and Jerome,  
 making a distinction in favour of Austin : “At Am-  
 “brosius, Origenes, Hieronymus censuerunt, Deum  
 “sua gratia inter homines dispensare, *prout ea quæque*  
 “*bene*

“ *bene usurum præviderit.* Adde et Augustinum in ea  
 “ fuisse aliquando sententia; sed, cum melius in Scrip-  
 “ turæ cognitione profecisset, non retractavit modo ut  
 “ evidenter falsam, sed fortiter confutavit.” Ib. sect. 8.

In the subsequent notes it will be seen, that the tenet of the Schools upon this intricate question widely differed from that of Calvin; and yet has it been imagined, that, at the period immediately preceding the Reformation, the Church of Rome was truly Calvinistical. Of all the Sententiarii, Aquinas attributed most to the agency of divine grace; it will nevertheless appear, that his ideas were, in truth, of a directly opposite tendency. Zuingle thus briefly and correctly states them: “ Thomæ Aquinatis (modo recte meminerim ejus philosophiæ) de prædestinatione sententia talis fuit; Deum, cum universa videat, antequam fiant, hominem prædestinare, *tum scilicet, cum per sapientiam viderit, qualis futurus sit.*” Opera, vol. i. p. 367. But upon this point, as the language of the Schools will speak sufficiently for itself, it seems unnecessary to enlarge. Perhaps, however, it may be requisite to point out, from publications of the time not strictly Scholastical, that similar opinions were taught in the Church at large. In the Sermons of Bernard de Buftis, who flourished about the year 1480, and who composed the Services “ de Conceptione B. Virginis,” and “ de Nomine Jesu,” received into the Offices of the Church, (Cave’s Histor. Literar. vol. ii. p. 196.) these passages occur. “ Scientia Dei de futuris contingentibus non est ita determinata, sicut est de necessariis, sed est *conditionata.*” vol. i. p. 206, ed. 1503. “ Et verum est, quod ipse Deus, qui vere est misericors, salvaret omnes, *si ipsi se disponderent.*” “ Licet, quia ipsi se *non* disponunt, ideo *non* salvantur.” “ . . . . Magne etiam habet virtutem attrahendi fer-  
 “ ruin,

“rum, et semper attrahit, nisi ferrum oleo inungatur,  
 “per quod virtus magnetis impediatur. Et hoc non  
 “est ratione magnetis, cujus virtus est indifferens ad  
 “omne ferrum, sed alterius impredientis. Et *similiter*  
 “Deus naturaliter est misericors; et *omnes paratus ad*  
 “*se clementer trahere.*” Ibid. vol. ii. p. 197. “Ma-  
 “gister in i. dist. 40. dicit, ‘Prædestinatio est quædam  
 “comparatio, qua Deus elegit, quos voluit, ante mundi  
 “constitutionem;’ sed dices, ‘Ergo est personarum ac-  
 “ceptor.’ Respondeo, quod non sequitur; nam ipse  
 “Deus ex hoc non acceptat *personas*, sed *merita*, et  
 “damnat *demerita*. Et ideo non *omnes* prædestinavit,  
 “quia *prævidit* quosdam in peccata duraturos. Unde  
 “illos tantum prædestinavit, quos *recte finituros* cogno-  
 “vit.” Ibid. p. 198. Such was the popular creed not  
 long before the Reformation. That at the period im-  
 mediately preceding it, and at its very commence-  
 ment, the doctrine of the Church remained the same,  
 is evident from the controversy of Fevre D’Etaples,  
 (Faber Stapulensis,) who was particularly patronised  
 by Margaret Queen of Navarre, and persecuted for  
 supposed heresy by the Sorbonne of Paris. Among  
 other accusations, he was thus charged by Natalis  
 Beda, whose censure of him was approved by the Sor-  
 bonne, (see Bayle’s Life, note f.) as having main-  
 tained the position of Necessity, in his Commentary  
 upon the 9th chapter of the Romans, which was pub-  
 lished in the year 1515. “Quod vero adjicit, scilicet,  
 “posse salvari non est in hominis voluntate, potestate,  
 “aut operibus, *plane hereticum est*, et perniciosissime  
 “scriptum. . . . . Quid redolere aliud videtur, nisi  
 “quod omnia futura *de necessitate* accidunt, quasi, quod-  
 “cunque agat homo, aut non agat, jam de eo latum  
 “sit judicium; neque si omnia justissima operetur, aut  
 “quæque perversa, illi nihil conferre potest, sed Dei  
 “*sola*



“*sola præscientia et electio.* Quo quidem dogmate toties non solum *per Ecclesiam*, sed *per omnes cum fide philosophantes reprobato*, quid magis exitiale moribus? Quid amplius omni politiæ Christianæ damnosum? *Stupeo totus* ego sane considerans hominem, qui, *inter Catholicos nutritus doctores*, tam facile in eorum potuit legere libris, divinam præscientiam nihil prorsus rerum contingentiae et libertati voluntatis obfistere, et tam crebro *publicis in disputationibus ac concionibus ad populum* nodum illum dissolutum audivit, ac aperiri lucidius; orbi etiam *nostro ævo* præsumpsit ejusmodi errorum rursus proponere tenebras.” Annot. Natal. Bedæ in Jac. Fabrum Stapulen. Libri duo. Propos. 59. ed. 1526. “But, perhaps, not the least convincing testimony may be found in the service of the Church itself, where the subsequent prayer occurs: “Omnipotens Sempiternæ Deus, qui vivorum dominaris simul et mortuorum, omniumque misereris, *quos tuos fide et opere futuros esse prænoscis*, te suppliciter exoramus, &c.” Missale ad Usus Sarisb. Orationes General.

Page 142, note (5).

Quantum ad secundum a quibusdam moventur dubia de prædestinatione. Et primo quæritur, “Cur me fecit Deus, ut damnaret.” Quibus respondendum est, quod nullos fecit Deus ad ipsos condemnandum, cum velit omnes homines salvos fieri, *quantum in se est*, dando scilicet antecedentia ad salutem, puta naturam rationalem, et gratiam offerendo, sed ipsam recipere recusamus. Nic. de Orb. lib. i. dist. 41.

Deus habet *præscientiam* etiam *de peccatis*; sed *prædestinatio* est *de bonis salutaribus*. Aquin. Expositio in Rom. cap. 8. *Prædestinatio* enim includit in suo intellectu *præscientiam* et *providentiam salutis omnium*. *Providentia* autem, ut dictum est, quamvis sit omnium, non

non tamen omnia *neccessario* contingunt, sed *secundum conditionem causarum proximorum*, quarum naturas et ordinem providentia et prædestinatio *salvat*. Præscientia etiam non imponit *neccessitatem* rebus, nec in quantum *est causa*, cum sit causa *prima*, cujus conditionem effectus non habet, sed causæ proximæ; nec ratione adæquationis ad rem scitam, quæ ad rationem veritatis et certitudinis scientiæ exigitur, quia adæquatio ista attenditur scientiæ Dei ad rem, *non secundum quod est in causis suis*, in quibus est, ut *possibile* futurum tantum, sed ad ipsam rem, *secundum quod habet esse determinatum*, prout est *præsens et non futurum*. Id. lib. i. dist. 40. quæst. 3. art. 1.

Page 143, note (6).

The knowledge of simple intelligence was thus defined: "Dicendum quod Deus dicitur scire aliquid dupliciter, vel scientia visionis, secundum quod videt res, quæ sunt, vel erunt, vel fuerunt, *non solum in potentia* causarum suarum, sed etiam *in esse proprio*, vel scientia *simplicis intelligentiæ*, secundum quod scit, quæ nullo tempore sunt, esse *in potentia* causarum suarum." Aquin. lib. i. dist. 39. quæst. 1. art. 2. But when the divine knowledge was considered as the cause of things, it was then denominated the knowledge of approbation: "Manifestum est autem, quod Deus per intellectum suum *causat* res, cum suum esset, ut suum intelligeret; unde necesse est, quod sua scientia sit causa rerum, *secundum quod habet voluntatem conjunctam*. Unde scientia Dei, secundum quod est causa rerum, consuevit nominari *scientia approbationis*." Id. Summ. 1. prim. quæst. 14. art. 8. This approving knowledge of God, however, was confined to that which is good and equitable, every defect in human nature being attributable to ourselves alone: "Istum autem *carere gratia* ex duobus contingit: tum  
" quia

“ quia ipse *non vult recipere*, tum quia Deus non sibi  
 “ infundit, vel non vult infundere. Harum autem  
 “ duorum talis est ordo, ut *secundum non sit nisi ex*  
 “ *suppositione primi*. Cum enim Deus non velit *nisi*  
 “ *bonum*, non vult istum carere gratia, nisi secundum  
 “ quod bonum est; sed quod iste careat gratia, non est  
 “ bonum *simpliciter*, unde hoc *absolute* consideratum  
 “ non est volitum a Deo. Est tamen bonum, ut ca-  
 “ reat gratia, si eam habere *non vult*, vel si ad eam ha-  
 “ bendam *negligenter se præparat*, quia *justum* est, et  
 “ hoc modo est volitum a Deo. Patet ergo quod hu-  
 “ jus defectus absolute causa prima *est ex parte hominis*,  
 “ qui gratia caret; sed *ex parte Dei non est* causa hujus  
 “ defectus, nisi *ex suppositione illius*, quod est causa *ex*  
 “ *parte hominis*.” Id. lib. i. dist. 40. quæst. 4. art. 2.  
 Neither was election stated to proceed from a principle  
 less just and impartial: “ Dicendum quod electio di-  
 “ vina non præexigit diversitatem gratiæ, quia hoc  
 “ electionem consequitur; sed *præexigit diversitatem*  
 “ *naturæ* in divina cognitione, et *facit diversitatem*  
 “ *gratiæ*, sicut *dispositio diversitatem naturæ facit*.” Id.  
 lib. i. dist. 41. quæst. 1. art. 2.

Page 144, note (?).

The equality of the divine will towards all men was  
 expressly asserted: “ Dicendum quod, quamvis Deus,  
 “ *quantum in se est*, *æqualiter* se habeat ad omnes, non  
 “ tamen *æqualiter* se habeat omnes ad ipsum, et ideo non  
 “ *æqualiter omnibus gratia præparatur*.” Aquin. lib. i.  
 dist. 4. quæst. 2. art. 2.

What was properly understood by the antecedent and  
 consequent will of God, is shortly explained by Nico-  
 laus de Lyra, in his Comment upon 1 Tim. ii. 4.  
 “ Dicitur voluntas *antecedens*, quum quis vult aliquid  
 “ *absolute*; *consequens* autem, quum vult aliquid *confi-*  
 “ *deratis circumstantiis et conditionibus particularibus*.”

For

For a fuller account of this distinction, see Aquin. Summ. 1. prim. quæst. 19. art. 6. and likewise in Lib. Sentent. lib. i. dist. 46. quæst. 1. art. 1. The antecedent and consequent will of the Schools Bernard de Bustis terms the absolute and conditional: “Vel clarius loquendo possumus considerare in Deo per modum intelligendi duas voluntates. . . . Prima voluntas, quam in Deo possumus considerare, est *absoluta*, videlicet quod Deus omnino velit salvare *omnes*, tam bonos quam malos. . . . Alio modo possumus considerare voluntatem Dei *conditionatam*, videlicet, quod velit salvare omnes homines, si ejus mandata servabunt, et a peccatis abstinebunt.” Rosarium Sermonum, vol. i. p. 198.

Page 144, note (8).

Contra est, quod dicunt Sancti communiter, Dionysius, Augustinus, et Anselmus, scilicet quod causa, quare iste non habet gratiam, est quia ipse noluit accipere, et non quia Deus noluit dare, *quia lumen suum omnibus offert*; quod tamen ab omnibus non percipitur, sicut nec lumen solis a cæco; sed obduracionis est ipsa carentia gratiæ, ergo obdurationis causa non est ex parte Dei. . . .

Ad quartum dicendum, quod Deus, *quantum in se est*, nulli est absens; sed homo a Deo præsentem se absens, sicut a præsentem lumine, qui claudit oculos. Aquin. lib. i. dist. 40. quæst. 4. art. 2.

Page 145, note (9).

“Utrum aliquis deleatur de libro vitæ? Affirmatur. . . . Est enim liber vitæ *conscriptio ordinatorum in vitam æternam*, ad quam ordinatur aliquis ex duobus, videlicet ex prædestinatione divina, et hæc ordinatio nunquam deficit, et ex gratia; quicumque enim gratiam habet, ex hoc ipso est dignus vita æterna. Et hæc ordinatio *deficit interdum*, quia aliqui ordinati  
“sunt

“ sunt ex gratia habita ad habendam vitam æternam,  
 “ a qua tamen *deficiunt per peccatum mortale*. . . . . Tales  
 “ possunt deleri de libro vitæ, ut deletio non referatur  
 “ ad notitiam Dei, quasi aliquid præsciat et postea ne-  
 “ sciat, sed *ad rem scitam, quia scilicet Deus scit aliquem*  
 “ *prius ordinari in vitam æternam, et postea non ordinari,*  
 “ *cum deficit a gratia.*” Aquin. Summ. I. prim. quæst.  
 24. art. 3. “ Liber vitæ conscriptio ordinatorum ex  
 “ prædestinatione, et præsentī gratia; ergo ordinatorum  
 “ *indefectibiliter et defectibiliter*. . . . . *Indefectibiles* sunt  
 “ scripti ad vitam æternam *in re ipsa*; *defectibiles* vero  
 “ sunt scripti ad vitam æternam *in sua causa*, scilicet,  
 “ *meritoria.*” Cardinal. Cajetan. Comment. in loc.  
 “ *Prædestinationis ordo est certus, et tamen prædestina-*  
 “ *tionis effectus contingenter eveniunt juxta libertatem*  
 “ *arbitrii.*” Id. Comment. quæst. 23. art. 6. “ Sic  
 “ igitur et ordo *prædestinationis* est certus, et tamen *li-*  
 “ *bertas arbitrii non tollitur, ex qua contingenter* provenit  
 “ *prædestinationis effectus.*” Aquinas, ibid.

The mistakes upon this subject of those, who have but partially consulted the speculations of the Schools, seem to have arisen from the want of correctly comprehending, what was meant by the *effect* of predestination, an effect always supposed to be contingent, the operations of free will, whether with or without grace, being considered only as foreknown, and not necessarily pre-determined.

Page 145, note (10).

The distinction between congruous and condign merit, the former only as meritum *secundum quid*, the latter as meritum *simpliciter*, has been pointed out in notes 4 and 5, Sermon IV. To the first species of merit the term *dispositio* in the following quotation refers.  
 “ Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod in illis verbis Am-  
 “ brof. non designatur, quod opus nostrum sit causa  
 “ volun-

“ voluntatis divinæ, neque etiam; quod sit causa ipsius  
 “ dationis gratiæ; sed solum *dispositio quædam*, ut hoc  
 “ intelligatur non de opere *sequente* gratiam, quod vir-  
 “ tutem merendi habet a gratia, et neque causa ejus  
 “ est, neque dispositio ad ipsam, sed de opere *præcedente*,  
 “ quod est *dispositio ad gratiam*. Illi enim *proponit* gra-  
 “ tiam infundere, quem *præscit se ad gratiam præpara-*  
 “ *turum*. . . . . Possumus dicere, quod Deus dat illi  
 “ gloriam, et non illi, quia iste *meruit*, et non ille. Et si-  
 “ militer *vult*, quod iste habeat, et non ille, quia iste *dig-*  
 “ *nus*, et non ille.” Aquin. lib. i. dist. 41. quæst. 1. art. 3.

Page 145, note (11).

I have remarked, that the predestination and repro-  
 bation of the Schools was universally maintained to be  
 contingent; hence the following question, “ Utrum  
 “ possibile est aliquem prædestinatum damnari, et præ-  
 “ scitum salvari?” was always decided in the affirma-  
 tive. Upon this head Occam remarks, “ Tenendum  
 “ est, quod, quicumque est prædestinatus, est *contingen-*  
 “ *ter* prædestinatus, itaque quod potest non prædestinari,  
 “ et per consequens potest *damnari*, quia potest non sal-  
 “ vari. Hoc potest quia cujuslibet salvatio dependet a  
 “ voluntate divina, *contingenter causante*, ergo in potes-  
 “ tate Dei est conferre vitam æternam, vel non conferre,  
 “ ergo quicumque potest non salvari. Præterea, nullo  
 “ adulto confertur vita æterna, nisi propter aliquod opus  
 “ meritorium, sed omne opus meritorium est *in potestate*  
 “ *merentis*, ergo talis potest non mereri, et per consequens  
 “ potest non salvari. Et eodem modo est de *præscito*, quia  
 “ nullus damnatur pœna perpetua, et hoc pœna sensus;  
 “ nisi propter suum demeritum. Sed omne demeritum  
 “ est *in potestate bene merentis*, ergo potest non deme-  
 “ reri, et per consequens potest salvari.” Lib. i. dist. 40.  
 quæst. 1.

The Scholastics, indeed, contended, that in the strict  
 philosophical

philosophical meaning of the term, no adequate cause either of predestination or reprobation exists in the creature. "*Nullius æterni potest aliquod temporale esse causa, et quicquid est in creatura est temporale, ergo nihil quod est in creatura potest causa prædestinationis et reprobationis.*" Occam. *ibid.* Nevertheless the same writer expressly admits such a cause *on the part of the effect*. After discussing the nature, connexion, and efficiency of causes in general, he states, "Potest dici sine prejudicio et assertionem, quod. . . prædestinationis est aliqua causa et ratio." . . . (excepting only the predestination of the Virgin Mary and some others, who were prevented by divine grace from sinning and losing eternal life.) "Prædestinationis . . . videtur esse aliqua ratio, quia sicut damnandi *ideo* reprobantur, quia prævidentur peccaturi *finaliter*, cum Deus non prius est ultor, quam aliquis sit peccator, ita est de prædestinatis. Prædestinantur, quia prævidentur *finaliter perseverare in charitate*, et quia Deus non conferet eis vitam æternam, nisi prius mererentur vitam æternam." *Ibid.*

Page 146, note (12).

See Serm. IV. note 14. page 311. and Serm. V. note 16.

Page 148, note (13).

The works of Luther abound with passages against speculating upon the will of God, beyond what the Scripture has clearly revealed respecting it, and against all philosophizing upon a particular predestination, according to the custom of the Schools; admitting only a general predestination founded upon Christianity. "Nemo igitur de divinitate *nuda* cogitet, sed has cogitationes fugiat, tanquam infernum, et ipsissimas Satanæ tentationes." Op. vol. vi. p. 92. "Attende et vide, ne tibi excidat, quod sæpe dixi, quomodo Christus his verbis sui et patris cognitionem conjungit et  
d d "compli-

“complicat, ita ut *solum per Christum et in Christo* Pater  
 “cognoscatur. Siquidem hoc sæpè dixi, quod iterum  
 “*atque iterum repetens dico*, quod etiam, *me mortuo*, om-  
 “nibus in memoria hæere velim, *ut omnes doctores non*  
 “*secus atque diabolum caveamus*, qui sublimibus illis  
 “articulis de Deo docere incipiunt *nude et sine Christo*.  
 “Sicut hætenus in Academiis *sophistæ et magistri nos-*  
 “*tri* fecerunt, *speculando* de suis operibus in cælo,  
 “quid esset, quid cogitaret, quid faceret *apud seipsum*,  
 “&c. Sed si secure agere volueris, et Deum appre-  
 “hendere, ac gratiam et auxilium penes illum inveni-  
 “re, tum nemini credas Deum te alibi, quam *in Christo*,  
 “reperiturum.” Vol. v. p. 192.

“Et Satan nulla alia via nos facilius *præcipitare* potest,  
 “quam ubi nos *ad considerationem majestatis* protraxerit.  
 “Cujus tanta est amplitudo, ut animi statim despera-  
 “bundi concidunt. Ideo Solomon etiam monuit,  
 “Qui scrutatur majestatem, opprimitur ab ea.’ . . . .  
 “His disputationibus animi paulatim assuefiunt ad pro-  
 “phanas quæstiones, ut cum Deo *tanquam cum lutifi-*  
 “*gulo rixentur*, unde necessario sequitur ruina. Quare  
 “abstinendum est a talibus cogitationibus.” Vol. v. p.  
 76. “De Deo, quatenus non est revelatus, nulla est  
 “fides, nulla scientia, et *cognitio nulla*. Atque ibi te-  
 “nendum est, quod dicitur, quæ supra nos nihil ad nos.  
 “Ejusmodi enim cogitationes, quæ, *supra*, aut *extra*  
 “revelationem Dei, sublimius aliquid rimantur, pror-  
 “sus Diabolicæ sunt, quibus nihil amplius proficiscitur,  
 “quam ut nos ipsos *in exitium præcipitemus*, quia obji-  
 “ciunt objectum inpervestigabile, videlicet Deum *non*  
 “revelatum. . . . . Detestari itaque et fugere scelera-  
 “tas istas voces debebamus, quas jactant Epicurei, si  
 “*neceffe est, hoc fieri, fiat*.” Vol. vi. p. 354. “Satis  
 “ostendimus tales cogitationes non secus ut Diabo-  
 “lum fugiendas, ac prorsus *aliam discendi viam*, ac de  
 “volun-



“ voluntate Dei cogitandi insistendam esse, scilicet,  
 “ *Deum in majestate et prædestinatione missum faciendum*  
 “ *esse.* Nam hæc prorsus comprehendere non possunt,  
 “ neque potest de tantis rebus cogitatio *sine scandalo*  
 “ *abire.* Hoc est vel *desperationem* ad tales cogitationes,  
 “ vel *impietatem dissolutissimam* sequi oportet. Qui vero  
 “ veram ad Dei et ejus voluntatis cognitionem viam in-  
 “ sistere cogitat, ei sic ambulandum est, ut *scandalum*  
 “ cavere, et *pietatis incrementa* consequi possit.” Postilla  
 Domestica, p. 57.

The object of Luther, in these and other similar passages, was to debar all enquiry into a divine will antecedent to Christianity, and to make the predestination of the person consequent to the conduct of the Christian; an object, which Calvin despised, and an order, which he reversed. “ In his persevera, *tanquam murus*  
 “ *abeneus,* nihil aliud inculcari tibi finens, quam quo  
 “ modo se ipse ostendit et manifestat *per verbum Christi.*”  
 Vol. v. p. 197. “ Ac initio quidem voluit Deus occur-  
 “ rere huic curiositati; sic enim suam voluntatem et  
 “ consilium proposuit; ‘ Ego tibi *præscientiam* et *præ-*  
 “ *destinationem* egregie manifestabo, sed non ista via *ra-*  
 “ *tionis et sapientiæ carnalis,* sicut tu imaginaris; sic fa-  
 “ ciam; ex Deo *non* revelato *fiam revelatus,* et tamen  
 “ *idem Deus manebo.*’ . . . . Tu habes Evangelium,  
 “ es baptizatus, habes absolutionem, es *Christianus,* et  
 “ tamen dubitas? . . . . Deus dicit tibi, ‘ En habes fili-  
 “ um meum, hunc audias et acceptes. Id si facis, jam  
 “ *certus* es de fide et salute tua.’ . . . . Omittendæ sunt  
 “ disputationes, et dicendum, ‘ *Ego sum Christianus.*’  
 “ . . . . Dedit tibi firmissima argumenta certitudinis et  
 “ veritatis suæ. Dedit Filium in carnem et mortem,  
 “ instituit sacramenta, ut scias eum non velle fallacem  
 “ esse, sed veracem., . . . . Atque ita de prædestinatione

“tua certus eris, remotis omnibus curiosis et periculosis quæ-  
 “sitionibus de Dei arcanis consiliis.” Vol. vi. p. 355.

To the operation or effect of the predestinating principle in the mind of God, which produces the election, not of individuals from a personal partiality, but of a church at large, upon motives the most merciful, and by rules the most just, the writings of Melancthon frequently allude. “De effectu electionis teneamus hanc consolationem, Deum, volentem non perire totum genus humanum, semper propter Filium per misericordiam vocare, trahere et colligere Ecclesiam, et recipere assentientes, atque ita velle semper aliquam esse Ecclesiam, quam adjuvat et salvat.” Loci Theologici de Prædest. “E contra vero ingens et immensa bonitas Dei est, quod, quanquam multi sunt prophani, tamen se patefecit certis testimoniis, et revelavit arcanum decretum suum de remissione peccatorum, et colligit sibi ex tam corrupta massa humani generis Ecclesiam æternam.” Disput. Oper. Lutheri, vol. ii. p. 505. “Magna autem consolatio primum hæc est, quod certo scimus ex verbo Dei, Deum immensa misericordia propter Filium semper colligere Ecclesiam in genere humano, et quidem voce Evangelii . . . . Sed dices, hæc consolatio eo prodest, quod scio aliis servari Ecclesiam, fortassis autem mihi id nihil prodest, et quomodo sciam qui sunt electi? Respondeo. Tibi quoque hæc generalis consolatio prodest, quia credere debes, tibi quoque servari Ecclesiam, et mandatum Dei æternum et immotum est, ut tu quoque audias filium, agas poenitentiam, et credas te recipi a Deo propter mediatorem. Talis cum es, discedens ex hac vita, certum est, te in numero electorum esse, sicut scriptum est, ‘Quos justificat, eosdem et glorificat.’ Opera Melancthi. vol. iv. p. 161. And that a principal part at least of Me-

lancthon’s

Melancthon's doctrine of predestination (precisely the same as Luther's) was pretty correctly understood at an early period, appears from an account, which Bucer gave of it, (not a too favourable judge,) in the year 1536, who represented this as its leading feature. "Repellenda est quæstio, 'Sumusne prædestinati?'" "Nam ut dictum, qui de hoc dubitat, nec vocatum se, nec justificatum, esse credere poterit, hoc est, nequit esse Christianus. Præsumendum igitur, ut nos omnes a Deo esse præscitos, præfinitos, separatos a reliquis, et selectos in hoc, ut in æternum servemur, hocque propositum Dei mutari non posse; et inde omnis nostra cogitatio curaque in hoc intendenda, ut prædestinationi huic Dei, et vocationi respondeamus, ut ad vitam æternam nos pro viribus, quas unquam Dominus suppeditavit, cooperemur. . . . Certe quos vocat Deus, si sequantur modo vocantem, prædestinavit eos, atque præscivit; justificabit quoque et glorificabit." Enar. Epist. ad Rom. p. 359. ed. 1536.

Page 149, note (14).

The Lutherans maintained, that all children were regenerated in Baptism, (not through the virtue of the Sacrament, but by the promise of God,) and received into the number of the elect. "Vere in Ecclesia recipit infantes, et lætemur in cœtu vocatorum electos esse." Melancth. Opera, vol. i. p. 320. "Spiritus Sanctus per Baptismum eis datur, qui efficit in eis novos motus, novas inclinationes ad Deum, pro ipsorum modo, nec id temere affirmatur. . . . Cum ergo certum sit, hos infantes esse partem Ecclesiæ, et placere Deo, certum hoc est, Deum in eis efficacem esse." Loci Theolog. de Baptismo. "Ita et nos Christiani per Baptismum sumus regenerati, et filii Dei effecti." Opera Lutheri, vol. vii. p. 102. "Quicquid hic factum est, id omne propter nos factum est, qui in illum credi-

“mus, et in nomen ejus *baptizati*, et *ad salutem desti-*  
*nati*, atque *electi sumus*.” Ibid. p. 355. “Sum factus  
 “salvus, sum *filius Dei*, et *hæres Dei*, quia sum *bapti-*  
*zatus*.” Vol. vi. p. 553. “Baptismus infantium de-  
 “fensus et ornatus est multorum scriptis apud nos. ....  
 “Sentimus eos in Baptismo fieri *filios Dei*, accipere  
 “Spiritus Sanctum, et *manere in gratia Dei*, *tamdiu*  
 “*quoad non effundunt eum peccatis actualibus*, ea ætate,  
 “quæ jam dicitur rationis compos.” Melanct. Opera,  
 vol. iv. p. 664. “Volo pios firmos et infirmos acce-  
 “dere ad Baptismum infantium in suis Ecclesiis, ....  
 “quia in eo cœtu sunt adhuc aliqui *electi et sancti*, ut  
 “*pueri*; et aliqui adulti recte sentientes, sed infirmi,  
 “qui tamen sunt *membra Christi*.” Melanct. Epist. in  
 Opusc. Calvini.

But while they asserted the fact, they denied, that  
 any efficacy is attributable to the Sacrament itself.  
 “Sophistæ quoque nugantur, cum disputant, *Quomodo*  
 “Baptismus justificet. Nam Thomas et Bonaventura  
 “sentiant, *quandam virtutem efficiendi a Deo aquæ in-*  
*ditam*, cum baptizatur infans, ut ita aqua Baptismi  
 “*sua virtute* creat justificationem. Contra nos dici-  
 “mus, *Aquam esse aquam*.” Opera Lutheri, vol. vi.  
 p. 52. “Papistæ somniant etiam parvulis infundi gra-  
 “tiam *virtute Sacramenti*. Hoc est falsissimum, quia  
 “*virtute promissionis* salvantur, et accipiunt Spiritum  
 “Sanctum, quia dixit Christus, ‘*Sinite parvulos ad*  
 “*me venire*. Talium enim est regnum cœlorum.” Ib.  
 p. 646.

Page 150, note (15).

“Alii fingunt Deum sedere in cœlo, et scribere *fa-*  
 “*tales leges*, *quasi in tabulis Parcarum*, secundum quas  
 “velit distribuere virtutes et vitia, sicut Stoici de fato  
 “suo sentiebant, et cogitant fatali motu impellit Pari-  
 “dem, et similes. Sed nos, *abjectis bis deliramentis*  
 “*humanæ*

“ *humanæ caliginis*, referamus oculos et mentem ad  
 “ testimonia de Deo proposita. Sciamus Deum esse  
 “ agentem vere liberum, et tantum velle bona, nec  
 “ velle peccata, . . . . Removeamus igitur a *Paulo Sto-*  
 “ *icas disputationes*, quæ fidem et invocationem ever-  
 “ tunt. Quomodo enim potest Saul credere aut invo-  
 “ care, cum dubitat promissionem ad se pertinere, aut  
 “ cum obrepit illa tabula Parcarum ?” Loci Theolog.  
 de Prædest. “ Deus non est *crudelis et immitis tyran-*  
 “ *nus*, non odit, non abjicit homines, sed amat; sicut  
 “ nos solemus amare ex nobis natos, non propter lu-  
 “ crum aut merita, sed quia odisse ex nobis natos non  
 “ possumus.” Lutheri Opera, vol. iv. p. 322.

I have remarked, (Serm. II. note 21.) that the doc-  
 trine of necessity, maintained in the first edition of the  
 Loci Theologici, was expunged from it by Melancthon  
 in the year 1535, and that of contingency substituted  
 for it; but the amended work of that year, when the  
 remark was made, I had not seen. I have since, how-  
 ever, met with it in a volume of his writings printed  
 at Basil in 1541. It avows the tenet of contingency  
 in the most unequivocal terms: “ Exercuit Ecclesiam  
 “ aliquoties et magnas tragoedias excitavit utraque dis-  
 “ putatio de causa peccati, et de contingentia. Et de  
 “ utraque re multa colligunt homines acuti *inextrica-*  
 “ *bilia et absurda*. Quæ quoniam habent *aliquid peri-*  
 “ *culi*, monendi sunt juvenes, ut, omissis illis infinitis  
 “ disputationibus, potius quærant *simplicem ac piam*  
 “ *sententiam utilem religioni et moribus*, in qua resistent,  
 “ nec finant se ab ea illis disputationum præstigiis ab-  
 “ duci. Est autem hæc pia et *vera* sententia *utraque*  
 “ *manu ac verius toto pectore* tenenda, quod Deus non  
 “ sit causa peccati, et quod Deus non velit peccatum.  
 “ Sed causæ peccati sunt voluntas diaboli, et voluntas  
 “ hominis. . . . Constituta autem hæc sententia, quod

“Deus non sit causa peccati, plane sequitur contingen-  
 “tiam concedendam esse. . . . Est autem libertas volun-  
 “tatis causa contingentiae nostrarum actionum. . . .  
 “Nec invehenda sunt in Ecclesiam deliramenta de Stoico  
 “fato, aut *περὶ ἀνάγκης*, quia sunt inextricabilia, et in-  
 “terdum nocent pietati et moribus. . . . Ab his opinio-  
 “nibus decet pios abhorreere auribus atque animis.”  
 Opera Melanct. Basil. 1541. p. 463.

In the 18th note also of the same Sermon, I have represented Beza as incorrect in stating, that Melancthon began in the year 1552 to censure the advocates of Stoicism, and thus indirectly to point at the Reformers of Geneva. From the above however it appears, that he reprobated the idea of introducing such a doctrine into the Church, before Calvin was distinguished either as an Author, or a Reformer.

It should be added, that, in his later works of almost every description, contingency is repeatedly alluded to, and strenuously defended.

Page 151, note (16).

The sentiments of Luther upon universal grace are clearly expressed in his epistolary correspondence, as well as in his more public productions. From the former, even of an early date, Seckendorf gives a quotation exactly to the point: “Clarius discimus,” the historian observes, “ex epistola egregia 20. Jul. ad insignem  
 “quendam virum in Saxonia inferiori, qui iisdem de  
 “prædestinatione cogitationibusangebatur, hoc anno  
 “(1528) Germanice scripta, quæ habetur tom. iv. alt.  
 “f. 428. et seq. ‘In hac præsupponendo præscivisse et  
 “decrevisse Deum omnia, et sic etiam salutem aut  
 “damnationem hominum, sciendum tamen esse dicit,  
 “Deum ab æterno serio voluisse et decrevisse, ut omnes  
 “homines salvi essent, et æterno gaudio potirentur.’  
 “Allegat dictum Ezech. xviii. 23. ‘Si igitur vult, ut  
 “pecca-

“peccatores sub quocunque cœli climate degant, convertantur a viis et vivant, non est indulgendum suggestis a diabolo cogitationibus, ut *separemus* nos ab illa gratia Dei, quæ est *secundum altitudinem cœli a terra, ab ortu ad occidentem*. Ps. ciii. 11, 12. Itaque omnes pœnitentes et auxilium ejus rogantes obumbrat: dives enim est in omnes, qui invocant illum. Rom. x. 12.’ . . . . Allegat electionem Dei Ephes. 1. “9. traditam; ‘ab illa,” dicit, “non a lege et *ratiocinatione* incipiendum esse.” Provocat ad angelum gaudium omni populo annuntiantem, Luc. ii. 10. “Non est *restringenda*,” ait, “*generalis promissio*, quæ gratiam bonis, malis, parvis, magnis, frigidis, calidis, aridis, et viridibus offert; non est *arctanda* ad illos, qui, talibus stolis induti, pii et sancti esse volunt.” Denique, ne illa universalitas in abusum vertatur, fol. 931. concludit cum distinctione loquendum esse, et clare, “Si Evangelium,” ait, “et verbum Dei accipis, illi inhæres, ejus promissionem tibi applicas, et in hac fide *ad finem usque perseveras*, salvaberis; sin minus, in æternum damnaberis.” Seckendorf, vol. i. lib. ii. sect. 43. §. 5.

In his Commentaries, and other writings, the same idea often occurs: “Quod autem Christum non omnes accipiunt, *ipsorum culpa* fit, quod non credunt, et indulgent diffidentiae suæ. Interim manet *sententia Dei* et *promissio universalis*, quod Deus omnes homines vult salvos esse. . . . Ecce colligendi *studium*, ut omnes colligat. Sed huic voluntati Dei *obstunt increduli*, cum verbo *parere* et id *accipere nolunt*. Itaque tantum reliquæ Israel colliguntur, et salvantur.” Vol. iv. p. 441. “Tantum per hunc salvatorem hæc liberatio omnibus constituenda est. Salvator hic non ejusmodi est, qui propter *quosdam*, et propter *quosdam non*, venerit. Paravit Deus, in-

“quit,

“quit, hoc salutare non ante *quorundam*, sed ante fa-  
 “ciem *omnium* populorum. . . . Simeonis non obscura  
 “verba sunt, quod Deus salutare paraverit ante fa-  
 “ciem omnium populorum, in quo salutem et vitam  
 “*omnes* consequuntur. De hac igitur voluntate evi-  
 “dentissime colligitur juxta Paulum, 1 Tim. ii. ‘Quod  
 “Deus velit omnes homines salvos fieri,’ non corporali  
 “tantum salute, verum æterna, contra peccatum et  
 “mortem. Nam *huc* illud salutare *destinatum est*, quod  
 “Deus omnibus populis paravit. Quis igitur hunc  
 “Deum metuat, quis ad ejus judicium expavescat,  
 “cum suam voluntatem de nostra salute cupidissimam  
 “declaret, ac *qui omnia ad salutem necessaria suppedi-*  
 “*tet?* Quod vero plerique pereunt, et salutare id non  
 “consequuntur, non hæc *culpa voluntatis divinæ* est,  
 “verum *perviciaciæ humanæ*, quæ voluntatem Dei as-  
 “pernantur, salutare Dei non curat, quod *a Deo desti-*  
 “*natum est*, ut *omnes* salvet. Si omnibus mendicis  
 “sublevatio egestatis suæ proponeretur, et tamen certi  
 “essent, qui hoc beneficio uti *nollent*; non culpa eo-  
 “rum esset, qui *donant*, sed qui *accipere nollent*.” Pos-  
 “tilla Domestica, p. 67. “Nam quid huic responderet,  
 “cui nos hoc testimonium ferre oportet, quod nobis  
 “suum Filium dederit, *universam gratiam in Baptismo*  
 “*et Evangelio* nobis exhibuerit?” Ibid. p. 218.  
 “Deus mundum sic dilexerit, ut Filium suum unige-  
 “nitum traderet. De hoc res certa est, quod *mundus*  
 “non significat *Mariam, Petrum, Paulum*. Verum  
 “*mundus* significat *totum genus mortalium* simul. Ita-  
 “que si credis *te hominem esse*, aut si hoc nondum sen-  
 “tis, si te cum aliis confer, ut te hominem esse intel-  
 “ligas, cur te sub vocabulo venire non poteris, cum  
 “Christus clavis verbis dicat, Deum Filium suum non  
 “solum *sanctæ Mariæ*, aut *Petro*, aut *Paulo*, verum  
 “*mundo* tradidisse, ut omnes eum accipiant, qui tan-  
 “tum



“tum *filii hominum* sunt? . . . . Univerſo mundo hoc  
“donum *deſtinatum eſt*.” Ibid. p. 144.

The univerſality of the Goſpel promiſe, in its moſt enlarged ſenſe, was likewise inculcated by Melancthon, who diſtinctly aſſumed it as a principal baſis of Scriptural predeſtination. It perpetually recurs, often in the ſame words, and always to the ſame effect, in almoſt all his productions. “Duo autem ſunt conſideranda in promiſſione Evangelii, videlicet, quod et *gratis* promittit juſtitiam, et quod promiſſio eſt *univerſalis*. Nam hæc duo exercent humanos animos. Diſputamus alias de *dignitate*, nos ideo non eſſe electos, quia ſumus indigni. Alias diſputamus de *particularitate*; etiamſi digni eſſemus, tamen Deum ſuos *quosdam elegiſſe*, quibus fuerit *æquior*. Ideoque negamus nobis ſperandam eſſe ſalutem, quia fortaiſſe non ſumus *in eo numero*. Utraque imaginatio *repudianda eſt*, et magnopere prodeſt adverſus eas diligenter munire pias mentes. Ideo neque *dignitatem* noſtram reſpicere debemus, neque ex *univerſali* promiſſione *particularem* efficere. Sed ſinguli nos in illam *univerſalem* includamus. Cum igitur de electione angimur, aut diſputamus, non ordimur a *noſtris ſupputationibus*, vel a *lege*, ſed a *promiſſione Evangelii*. Si quis extra Evangelium cauſam quærit electionis, is non poteſt non *errare*. Ideo non ſinamus nos ab Evangelio avelli, ac cæteras ſupputationes procul rejiciamus.” Loci Theolog. de Prædeſt. Ed. 1535. “Ut prædicatio pœnitentiæ univerſalis eſt, et omnes arguit, ut Rom. iii. clare dicitur; ita et *promiſſio gratiæ eſt univerſalis*, ut multa dicta teſtantur. . . . . Quare non deſlectamus oculos atque animos a promiſſione *univerſali*, ſed in hanc nos includamus, et ſciamus *vere* in ea voluntatem Dei *expreſſam* eſſe. . . . . Removeamus igitur a Paulo *Stoicas diſputationes*,

“nes,

“nes, quæ fidem et invocationem evertunt. . . . Ad-  
 “versus has imaginationes discamus voluntatem Dei  
 “ex Evangelio, agnoscamus promissionem esse *universalem*,  
 “*salem*, ut fides et invocatio accendi possit.” Ibid.  
 Ed. 1545. “Prodest piis tenere, quod promissio sit *uni-*  
 “*versalis*, nec debemus de voluntate Dei *aliter* judi-  
 “care, quam *juxta verbum revelatum*.” Opera, vol. iv.  
 p. 499. “Est autem utraque concio *universalis*, præ-  
 “dicatio pœnitentiæ et promissio. Utrique igitur om-  
 “nes assentiamur, agamus pœnitentiam, credimus om-  
 “nes in Filium, nec disputemus *de alia arcana volun-*  
 “*tate*, nec *figamus* in Deo *contradictorias voluntates*.”  
 Vol. ii. p. 347. “Similitudo *de luto et figulo* non hoc  
 “vult, *nihil* agere impios, sed eatenus convenit, quod  
 “*ex una massa generis humani* Deus alios *suo* *judicio* sal-  
 “vat, alios damnat. Causæ in similitudine non om-  
 “nino accommodari possunt. Tenenda est enim sen-  
 “tentia, quod Deus not sit *causa peccati*. Retinendum  
 “et hoc est, quod promissio sit *universalis*.” Vol. iii.  
 p. 1017. “Sæpe autem dixi, necessariam esse confide-  
 “rationem particulæ *universalis*, ut unusquisque se in  
 “promissionem *universalem* includat, nec fingat in Deo  
 “*προσωποληψίαν*, aut *contradictorias voluntates*.” Vol.  
 iv. p. 168. How differently Melancthon interpreted  
 the celebrated passage, “Non est acceptio personarum  
 “apud Deum,” from Calvin, will appear by the fol-  
 lowing quotation: “Contra hanc mensuram facere in-  
 “æqualitas est, quæ est *injusta* et *tyrannis*. Ideo cum  
 “dicitur, apud Deum non est acceptio personarum,  
 “tribuitur ei *laus justitiæ et æqualitatis*, cujus hæc  
 “mensura est. *Universaliter* irascitur Deus peccato in  
 “homine, et *universaliter* accipit omnes ad Mediato-  
 “rem confugientes. Hanc mensuram suo sapientissi-  
 “mo et justissimo consilio sanxit, et vult immotam esse.  
 “Ac fingere, quod non fervet hanc æqualitatem, est tri-  
 “buere

“buere ei προσωπολήψιαν. Ideo et Paulus inquit, ‘Deus vult omnes salvos fieri;’ id est, *æqualis* est omnibus juxta mensuram, quam instituit. Et *quod ad ipsius voluntatem attinet, vult omnes homines salves facere*; sed multi *sua culpa* oblatum beneficium non accipiunt.” Vol. iv. p. 71. See vol. i. p. 23. vol. iii. p. 434, p. 777, p. 1014. vol. iv. p. 86, p. 160, p. 162, p. 173. The same argument likewise is clearly and forcibly urged in an Exposition of the Nicene Creed, (vol. i. p. 420.) which Melancthon sent to Cranmer in the year 1550.

Calvin’s sentiments upon the point are clearly explained in his Institute: “Jam et tertia *absurditate* Dei prædestinationem *infamant ejus adversarii*. Quum enim non alio referamus, quam ad divinæ voluntatis arbitrium, quod universali exitio eximantur, quos in regni sui hæredes Deus assumit, ex eo colligunt, apud ipsum ergo esse *acceptiorem personarum*. . . . Alio sensu negat Scriptura Deum esse personarum acceptorem, quam quo ipsi judicant, siquidem *personæ* vocabulo *non hominem* significat, sed quæ *in hominum oculis conspicua*, vel favorem, gratiam, dignitatem, conciliare, vel odium, contemptum, dedecus conflare solent,” Lib. xxiii. sect. 10. “Quare *falso et pessime* Deum *inæqualis justitiæ* infimulant nonnulli, quod *non eundem erga omnes tenorem* in sua prædestinatione servat.” Ibid. sect. 11.

Page 151, note (17).

The idea of grace being offered to all, but communicated only to a few, (the principal hinge of the Calvinistical predestination,) was strongly reprobated by Luther. “Curiosis in posteriore sententia, ‘*Multi sunt vocati, pauci electi*,’ magnâ materia absurditatis et impiarum cogitationum est. ‘Quos Deus eligit, *necessario* salvantur; e contra vero, quos non eligit, quicquid  
‘ etiam

‘etiam fecerint, quaecunque pietatis studium præsent,  
 ‘tamen exitium declinare non poterint, neque salutem  
 ‘consequentur. Proinde ergo me *necessitati* non oppo-  
 ‘nam. Si ita destinatum est, ut salver, salvabor; sin-  
 ‘minus, irritum erit, quicquid conatus fuero.’ Omnes  
 ‘facile judicare possunt, quanta perversitas et dissolutio  
 ‘ex cogitationibus hisce *impiis* emergat . . . . Quo-  
 ‘modo *nostra perniciæ delectari* posset, cum nihil om-  
 ‘nium rerum prætermittit, ut hominibus vitam et sa-  
 ‘lutem instauret? Atque hic demum verus aditus ad  
 ‘Deum est, sicut Christus etiam de hoc concionatur,  
 ‘Joan. iii. ‘Sic Deus dilexit mundum, ut Filium suum  
 ‘unigenitum traderet, ut omnis credens in eum non  
 ‘pereat, sed habeat vitam æternam.’ Verum, si nunc  
 ‘hæ cogitationes cum superioribus de prædestinatione  
 ‘conferantur, id certo deprehendetur, priores *ex dia-*  
 ‘*bolo* esse, quæ hominibus *cum exitiali scandalo* sunt, ut  
 ‘vel nunc *desperent*, vel *omnem veræ pietatis sensum ab-*  
 ‘*jiciant*. Nam de Dei bona voluntate erga se nulla fi-  
 ‘ducia esse potest.

‘*Alii* sunt, qui hæc verba sic interpretantur: Multi  
 ‘sunt vocati; id est, Deus *multis* suam gratiam *offert*;  
 ‘pauci vero sunt electi; id est, *cum paucis* suam gra-  
 ‘tiam *communicat*, nam pauci salvantur. *Valde impia*  
 ‘hæc sententia est. *Nam quis non Deum summe oderit,*  
 ‘si de Deo non aliter sentiat, quam *ejus voluntatis*  
 ‘*culpa fieri, ut non salvemur.*” Postilla Domestica, p.  
 57. For the remainder of this passage see note 23.

Page 151, note (18).

‘Quia a lege et collatione meritorum disceditur, dis-  
 ‘putat mens Deum esse personarum acceptorem; ex  
 ‘toto genere humano *quosdam excerpere*, quos sibi ad-  
 ‘jungat, *cæteros pares rejicere*. *Talis electio sine causis*  
 ‘videtur *tyrannica*. Huic tentationi opponatur uni-  
 ‘versalis promissio, quæ testatur Deum offerre *omnibus*  
 ‘salu-

" salutem, nec dubium est, mandatum esse Dei, ut huic  
 " promissioni omnes credant; item ut omnes audiant  
 " Filium Dei. Quos igitur eligit? Eligit eos, qui se  
 " sustentant promissione, quæ propter Filium proposita  
 " est. Quanquam igitur *non propter hominum merita*  
 " eligit, tamen *discrimen* est inter eos, qui recipiuntur,  
 " et cæteros." Melancth. Opera, vol. iii. p. 683. "Est  
 " igitur in voluntate Dei causa electionis *miseriordia et*  
 " *meritum Christi*, sed concurrere oportet *apprehensionem*  
 " *nostram*. Cum enim promissio gratiæ sit universalis, ut  
 " manifestum est, et necesse sit nos obedire promissioni,  
 " *aliquod discrimen* inter electos et rejectos *a voluntate*  
 " *nostra* sumendum est, videlicet, *repugnantes promissioni*  
 " *rejici*; e contra vero *amplectentes promissionem* recipi."  
 Ib. p. 777. "Elegit Deus, qui vocare nos ad Filii agni-  
 " tionem decrevit, et vult *generi humano* suam volunta-  
 " tem et sua beneficia innotescere. *Approbat* igitur et  
 " *eligit obtemperantes vocationi*." Loci Theolog. de Præ-  
 dest.

Nor did Melancthon withhold from the human  
 mind, assisted by divine grace, the ability of turning to  
 God, and embracing his promised mercy. "Certissi-  
 " mum est ex Evangelio displicere Deo omnes, in qui-  
 " bus non est *pœnitentia seu conversio* . . . . . Non re-  
 " moretur te hæc imaginatio, quod *non possis* efficere  
 " conversionem. Imo potes, *Deo juvante*, et ipse *vere*  
 " vult *juvare*, et juvat petentes." Vol. iii. p. 530.

From the sentiments of Melancthon upon divine equi-  
 ty, it seems not easy to distinguish these of Bullinger.  
 "Salvat autem gratuito, quos salvat, per Christi videli-  
 " cet meritum; perdit item juste et propter peccata et  
 " impietatem, quos damnat. Velle enim Dei non est  
 " *tyrannica quædam et herilis licentia*, de qua poeta, 'Sic  
 " *volo, sic jubeo*, sit pro ratione voluntas;' sed Dei volun-

" tas

“tas *justissima et æquissima est.*” Bullingeri Comment. in Roman. p. 61.

Page 152, note (19).

The Lutherans, always anxious to repress presumptuous speculation and personal conceit, unambiguously taught, that we may fall from grace both *totally* and *finally*. “Non sunt frigide et oscitanter suspicienda hæc verba, ‘A gratia excidistis;’ sunt enim valde emphatica. Qui excidit a gratia, amittit *simpliciter* expiationem, remissionem peccatorum, justitiam, libertatem, vitam, &c. quam Christus sua morte et resurrectione nobis emeruit: Et vicissim *acquirat in locum illorum*, iram et judicium Dei, peccatum, mortem, servitutem diaboli, ac *damnationem æternam.*” Luth. Oper. vol. v. p. 405. “Quid igitur, inquires, de his exemplis statuemus?” (viz. the reprobation of Ham after a previous and long possession of divine favour: “*nisi credidisset et orasset, nisi timuisset Deum*, neutiquam esset servatus in arca, tamen *postea reprobatur*”) “nihil aliud quam quod proposita nobis sunt ad instillandum nobis timorem Dei, ne putemus post *semel* acceptam gratiam, nos non posse iterum a gratia excidere.” Vol. vi. p. 98. “Cæterum si sectarii quidam orirentur, quorum nonnulli jam forsan adsunt; et tempore seditionis rusticanæ mihi ipsi in conspectum veniebant, sentientes omnes eos, qui *semel* Spiritum aut remissionem peccatorum accepissent, et credentes facti essent, etsi deinde *peccarent, manere tamen in fide*, et peccatum ipsis *nihil obesse*: hinc voces ipsorum; ‘Fac quidquid lubet, modo credas, nihil tibi nocet, fides omnia peccata delet, &c.’ addunt præterea; ‘Si quis post fidem et Spiritum acceptum peccet, *eum nunquam Spiritum et fidem vere habuisse*’ et tam *insanos* homines vidi, et audiui multos, et vereor, ne adhuc in nonnullis *dæmon iste latitans habitet*: si igitur, inquam;

“tales

“ *tales in posterum etiam orirentur, sciendum et docendum est, quod, si sancti, qui originale peccatum adhuc habere se sentiunt, et quotidie de eo pœnitent, et cum eo luctantur, insuper ruant in manifesta peccata, ut David in adulterium, homicidium, et blasphemiam, eos excutere fidem et Spiritum sanctum.*” Smalcald. Art. de falsa pœnitentia, anno 1537.

Seckendorf remarks, that Luther, Bugenhagenius, and Melancthon jointly expressed their disapprobation of a certain production, because the author of it had contemplated predestination in a dangerous point of view, and had maintained, that the elect lose not the Holy Spirit, when they fall into manifest crimes. “*Assseverant autem,*” he adds, “*se semper unanimiter in omnibus Ecclesiis contrarium docuisse; nempe, si quis sanctus et fidelis sciens et ex proposito contra præcepta Dei peccet, non amplius esse sanctum, sed veram fidem et Spiritum sanctum abjecisse.*” Vol. ii. lib. iii. p. 135. Upon such a principle then Luther conceived, that many begin well, but fail in the midst of their Christian labours; “*Multi præclare incipiunt, sed in medio fessi finem deserunt;*” vol. v. p. 67. and that it is impossible to determine who will remain faithful: “*Non potest quidem certo demonstrari, quis futurus posthac sit, aut mansurus inter eos, quos Christo dedit Pater.*” Seckendorf, vol. ii. p. 85.

In the Saxon Confession likewise the same subject is directly noticed. “*Manifestum est aliquos renatos contristare et excutere Spiritum Sanctum, et rursus abjici a Deo, ac fieri reos iræ Dei, et æternarum pœnarum. . . . Cum igitur homines non retinent fidem . . . aut violant ullum præceptum Dei contra conscientiam, effundunt Spiritum sanctum, et rursus fiant rei iræ Dei et pœnæ æternæ; et nisi fiat conversio, tales morientes abjiciuntur in æternas pœnas.*” De Discrimine Peccati.

Thus too, for the express purpose of proving, that a fall from grace may be final, as well as total, Melancthon frequently referred to the example of Saul. "Exempla cogitemus Saulis et Davidis, qui et beneficia, quæ recensui, tenuerunt ante lapsum, et post lapsum *exuti* tantis bonis, pœnas senserunt, quas recipiunt. Et Saul *prorsus periit, oppressus æternis pœnis*; David vero rursus ad Deum conversus est." Loci Theolog. p. 431. But in other passages he is, if possible, still more explicit: "Qui aguntur Spiritu Sancto, hi sunt filii Dei; sed ruentes contra conscientiam, effundunt et perturbant Spiritum Sanctum; *desinunt igitur esse filii Dei.*" Ibid. p. 280. "Affirmo etiam labentes in talia scelera excutere Spiritum Sanctum, et rursus fieri reos æternæ pœnæ, quorum *aliqui* redeuntes ad pœnitentiam; ut Aaron, David, rursus ad Deum convertuntur, et recipiuntur in gratiam; *multi non redeuntes ruunt in æternas pœnas.*" Op. vol. i. p. 375.

Page 152, note (20).

When Melancthon heard, that Calvin had imprisoned Bolsec at Geneva, for a difference of opinion upon the point of predestination, he communicated the circumstance to his friends, with the following reflections upon it: "Lelius mihi scribit tanta esse Genevæ certamina *de Stoica necessitate*, ut carceri inclusus sit quidam *a Zenone* dissentiens. O rem miseram! Doctrina salutaris obscuratur *peregrinis* disputationibus." Epistolæ Lond. p. 396. "Ac vide *seculi furōres*, certamina Allobrogica *de Stoica necessitate* tanta sunt, ut carceri inclusus sit quidam, qui a *Zenone* dissentit. . . . Et mitiores sunt Tigurini." Anno 1552. Ibid. p. 923.

I have remarked, (p. 240.) that Bolsec represented the doctrine of the Lutheran Reformer as adverse to that of Calvin. Hence the latter, who was not ignorant



rant of the fact, how much soever he chose to disseminate it, wrote to Melancthon upon the subject, and solicited in the most pressing, but certainly not in the most conciliating, manner, a modification of his sentiments. In this letter the following passages, in addition to that already given, p. 240. are worthy of observation. At the commencement of it, Calvin states a report, which had reached him, respecting Melancthon's anger at the reception of a preceding monitory epistle. "*Relatum mihi fuerat, sic te, mea quadam libera admonitione, quæ tamen longe aliter afficere te debuerat, fuisse offensum, ut epistolam coram aliquot testibus conscinderes. Etsi autem parum credibilis erat nuncius, ex quo tamen longo temporis successu variis signis confirmatus est, aliquid tandem suspicari coactus sum.*" After stating the appeal of Bolsec in the extract already given, he adds; "*Me non leviter pungit quæ in nostra dicendi ratione nimis palam conspicitur repugnantia. . . . Cum res*" (he means according to his own theory) "*adeo plana sit, te ex animi sensu prorsus diversum tradere, nemo erit sani judicii, cui persuadeas. Curam simul et dolorem mihi auget, quod te video hac in re prope modum esse tui dissimilem. Audio enim, cum tibi oblata esset formula nostræ cum Tigurina Ecclesia consensionis, protinus, arrepto calamo, sententiam unam, quæ Dei electos a reprobis parce et sobrie discernit, abs te fuisse confossam. Quod certe ab ingenii tui mansuetudine, ut alia taceam, valde abhorret. Itaque ut meum libellum*" (viz. de æterna Dei prædestinatione) "*legere vel saltem gustare sustineas, non rogo, quia id frustra mihi facturus video.*" Epist. Calvini, p. 108, 109. This epistle, (evidently written under a very sensible mortification,) which is dated December 1552, remained unanswered; for in Sep-

tember 1554, we find Calvin making a second ineffectual experiment upon the same subject: "Quamquam  
 " meis ultimis literis abs te *non fuisse responsum* doleo,  
 " et valde miror, fastidio tamen vel contemptu id esse  
 " factum, quum nihil minus in naturam moresque  
 " tuos cadat, suspicari nequeo. Itaque nuncium hunc  
 " nactus, qui suam mihi in literis tibi reddendis ope-  
 " ram obtulit, *tentandum rursus putavi, num forte quid*  
 " *possem elicere.* . . . . *Manifestum certe dissidium in*  
 " scriptis nostris extari, pessimi exempli esse vides.  
 " Nec vero hanc tollendæ *discrepantiæ* legem præscri-  
 " bo, ut tu mihi assentiaris; sed ne pudeat nos sacris  
 " Dei oraculis subscribere. Quærendæ vero concilia-  
 " tionis quæcunque tibi placuerit ratio, eam libenter  
 " amplector." Ibid. p. 133, 134. To this last letter Melancthon immediately sent a very short reply, no-  
 " ticing some other topics, which it contained, but still  
 " preserving an inflexible silence upon the principal  
 " question thus repeatedly pressed upon him. Ibid.  
 " p. 148.

How impracticable the adoption was of any inter-  
 mediate terms between their discordant sentiments,  
 without a manifest sacrifice of principle, the preceding  
 extracts from Melancthon's writings sufficiently prove.  
 But, besides the opposite tendency of their respective  
 opinions in a general point of view, on some important  
 particulars an approximation seemed impossible. Cal-  
 vin observed, " Verum mihi *acutius ac prudentius* vide-  
 " tur perspexisse *Valla*, . . . qui supervacaneam esse  
 " contentionem ostendit, quoniam et *vita et mors* divi-  
 " næ magis *voluntatis*, quam *præscientiæ*, sunt actio-  
 " nes." Instit. lib. iii. cap. 23. sect. 6. And again,  
 " Non dubitabo igitur cum Augustino simpliciter fa-  
 " teri, *voluntatem Dei* esse rerum *necessitatem*, atque id  
 " *necessario* futurum esse, quod ille *voluerit*." Ibid.  
 sect.

sect. 8. On the other hand Melancthon asserted,  
 “*Errat Valla, cum detrabit libertatem voluntati propter*  
 “*prædestinationem. . . . Falsa est et pernicioſa moribus*  
 “*et religioni Stoicorum opinio, quæ affirmant omnia*  
 “*neceſſario evenire. Contingentia conſtanter defenden-*  
 “*da eſt, niſi enim contingentia ponatur, ſequitur, ut*  
 “*Deus dicatur eſſe auctor peccati.*” Disputat. Luth.  
 Oper. vol. i. p. 478. The former argued, that Adam’s  
 fall was decreed by an abſolute will of God. “*Nec*  
 “*abſurdum videri debet, quod dico, Deum non modo*  
 “*primi hominis caſum, et in eo poſteriorum ruinam*  
 “*prævidiſſe, ſed arbitrio quoque ſuo diſpenſaſſe.*” Inſtit.  
 ibid. ſect. 8. The latter, that it was contingent, and  
 not preordained: “*Heva et Adam ſua libertate averten-*  
 “*tur ſe a Deo, ita hæ (actiones) ſunt veriſſime contin-*  
 “*gentes, et nequaquam neceſſariæ. Adam violans man-*  
 “*datum Dei, acceſſit ſibi mortem, quia veriſſimum eſt*  
 “*Deum non voluiſſe, nec approbaſſe id peccatum.*”  
 Vol. i. p. 408. a ſpecies of comment, which the Inſti-  
 tute calls frigid: “*Tam frigidum commentum ſi reci-*  
 “*pitur, &c.*” Ibid. Calvin inflexibly maintained what  
 was ſuppoſed to be a contradiction in the divine will,  
 which invites, according to him, all to ſalvation, but  
 admits only the elect. “*Objiciunt nonnulli, Deum*  
 “*ſibi fore contrarium, ſi univerſaliter omnes ad ſe invi-*  
 “*tet, paucos vero electos admittat. Sic promiſſionum*  
 “*univerſitas diſcretionem ſpecialis gratiæ, ſecundum*  
 “*eos, tollit.*” Ibid. lib. iii. cap. 22. ſect. 10. “*Ali-*  
 “*quid diſſerui, eorum errorem reſellens, quibus gene-*  
 “*ralitas promiſſionum videtur æquare totum humanum*  
 “*genus.*” Ibid. cap. 24. ſect. 1. But Melancthon,  
 aſſerting a real, and not a fictitious, univerſality in  
 God’s promiſes, vindicated the conſiſtency of the De-  
 ity: “*Cum dictum eſt neceſſario judicandum eſſe de*  
 “*voluntate Dei ex verbo ab ipſo tradito, et non ex ima-*  
 “*ginationibus*

“*ginationibus humanis*, tenenda est etiam hæc regula,  
 “Non esse ponendas *contradictorias voluntates* in Deo,  
 “quia Deus *verax* est. Cum igitur promissio sit *uni-*  
 “*versalis*, . . . . *includamus nos in promissionem univer-*  
 “*salem*, ‘Venite ad me omnes, &c.’ et eum *ad nos*  
 “pertinere statuamus.” Opera, vol. iv. p. 162. See  
 also the conclusion of notes 16 and 22.

The Lutheran Reformer, indeed, seems to have entertained a complete abhorrence of Stoicism: “*Non sum Stoicus*,” he observed, “et aliquanto fortius dimico cum Zenonis familia de fato, quam nostri belatores ad Danubium et ad Albim præliati sunt.” Epist. Lond. p. 370. “Removeamus igitur a Deo *Stoicam torvitatem*, et vere nos ab eo diligere statuamus, cum condita σοφῆς in natura hominum testetur in ipso etiam esse verum et flagrantem amorem.” Ibid. p. 557. And, when about to be attacked by two of his most inveterate enemies (Flaccius and Gallus) on this very account, he thus mentions the threatened controversy: “Audio mihi quosdam bellum illaturos de περὶ ἀναγκῆς σωτηρίας, quod si moverint, judico me Deo et Ecclesiæ debere hoc officium, ut *deliramenta contumeliosa contra Deum refutem*.” Anno 1555. Ibid. p. 458. See p. 266, ep. 84; p. 271, ep. 96; p. 405, ep. 444; and p. 463, ep. 593, 594, 595, and 596.

Page 152, note (2<sup>1</sup>).

At *Stoicæ illæ disputationes execrandæ sunt*, quas asserunt aliqui, disputantes, omnia peccata *paria* esse; electos *semper* retinere Spiritum Sanctum, etiam cum *lapsus atroces admittunt*. Loci Theolog. p. 126. Intueamur verbum Dei nobis traditum, ut voluntatem Dei monstret, et expavescamus agnoscentes iudicium Dei propositum in verbo, et in exemplis, *nec confirmemus in stultis securitatem et cæcitatem*. Ibid. p. 125.

Page 153, note (22).

At the period of the Reformation the Scholastics asserted, in direct terms, that individuals were predestinated solely on account of their personal merits: "*Recentiores Scholastici tantum humano judicio dixerunt causam electionis esse merita, seu bona opera liberæ voluntatis humanæ. Et hæc imaginatio orta est ex ignoratione Evangelii.*" Melancth. Opera, vol. iii. p. 1014.

It was principally in opposition to this dogma of the Schools, that Melancthon, in the first (as well as later) corrected edition of his *Loci Theologici*, assumed the Gospel promise as the basis of predestination, no less than of justification. In that edition the chapter "de Prædestinatione" thus commences: "Neque ex ratione, neque ex lege, sed ex Evangelio judicandum est de prædestinatione. Deinde non alia causa prædestinationis, quam justificationis, quærenda est. Hæc si quis constituerit initio, facile se ex multis quæstionibus explicabit. Nam, si tantum ex Evangelio judicandum est, et si prædestinatio cum justificatione conferenda est, una et simplex via est; sicut cum de justificatione quærimus, ordiendum est a verbo, seu Evangelio. Porro et singulorum tentationes de electione, et scriptorum eadem de re disputationes, partim a ratione ordiuntur sine verbo Dei, partim a lege. Homines imaginantur causam electionis esse nostram dignitatem, seu merita, quia ita judicant ratio et lex. Ideo in hanc sententiam facile dilabuntur Scholastici doctores recentiores omnes, quia tantum docent justitiam legis. Sed nos meminerimus ad Evangelium respiciendum esse." Melancthon then proceeds to state, as in the quotation, note 16, the gratuity and universality of the Gospel promise; the former against the Scholastical idea of an election by merit, the latter

against that of those, who argued for an 'irrespective election of favourites ; an argument, at that time occasionally advanced, and in general for the worst of purposes, but not yet systematized by Calvin, whose writings were then unknown. "Disputamus alias de dignitate, nos ideo non esse electos, quia sumus indigni. Alias disputamus de particularitate, etiam si digni essemus, tamen Deum suos quosdam elegisse, quibus fecerit æquior. . . . Utraque imaginatio repudianda est." Having thus laid the foundation of election in the gratuitous and universal will of God, he contends, that some cause of discrimination, although no dignity, is assignable in its application to individuals, who are required to embrace and retain the proffered mercies of Christianity. "Tum cum statuendum sit promissionem vere universalem, quod ad voluntatem Dei attinet, sicut a posteriore in justificatione dicimus aliquam in accipiente causam esse, videlicet, non dignitatem, sed quia promissionem apprehendit, cum qua Spiritus Sanctus est efficax, quem admodum Paulus inquit, 'Fides ex auditu est ;' ita et de electione a posteriore judicemus, videlicet, haud dubie electos esse, qui misericordiam fide apprehendunt, nec abjiciunt eam fiduciam ad extremum." This Scriptural position of the Lutheran Reformer was not only disapproved, but pointedly attacked, by Calvin. "Quanquam satis jam liquet Deum occulto consilio libere, quos vult, eligere, aliis rejectis, nondum tamen nisi dimidia ex parte exposita est gratuita ejus electio, donec ad singulas personas ventum fuerit, quibus Deus non modo salutem offert, sed ita assignat, ut suspensa vel dubia non sit effectus certitudo." Instit. lib. iii. cap. 21. sect. 7. "Duo autem errores hic cavendi sunt. . . . Alii . . . nescio qua ratione inducti, electionem a posteriori suspendunt, quasi du-

"bia

“*bia* effet, atque etiam *inefficax*, donec fide *confirmetur*.” Ibid. cap. 24. sect. 3.

Page 154, note (23).

From the *Postilla Domestica* it appears, that Luther maintained not any election from eternity in the mind of God, except such as was regulated by an election in time, according to the Christian piety of the individual. “Multi, inquit, vocati. Nam prædicatio Evangelii universalis et publica est, omnibus patens, quicunque suscipere volunt. Ac *Dei voluntas hæc est*, cum eam sic invulgat, ut *omnes credant et salventur*. Verum quid accidit? Sicut in proximo Evangelio sequitur: ‘Pauci electi sunt.’ Hoc est, pauci id agunt, ut *suam pietatem Deo probent*. Nam quidam audiunt, et tamen non tanti faciunt, ut propterea in discrimen venire velint. Quidam audiunt, sed magis curant divitias et voluptates. Id vero Deo non placet, ac tales suo regno non dignatur. Id Christus appellat *non eligi*, non *talem pietatem declarare*, quam *Deus probet*. Isti vero *electi* sunt, et Deo placentes, qui diligenter Evangelium audiunt, in Christum credunt, *fidem in bonis fructibus declarant*, neque ejus causa quicquam suffinere recusant.

“Hæc sententia *vera* est, neque *scandalizat homines ad perniciem*, sed instructos reddit ad salutem. Nam sic de rebus veram rationem inire oportet, si Deo placere *velint* et *electi esse*, ut malam conscientiam caveant, contra mandata Dei non delinquant, peccatis resistent, verbum Dei sedulo audiant, id studiose meditentur. . . . Atque hi demum veri *Christiani* evadunt. Ubi e contra ii, qui sentiunt Dei voluntatem *non esse*, ut *omnes salventur*, aut in desperationem ruunt, aut in *securissimam impietatem dissolvuntur*.” *Postill. Domest.* p. 58. This quotation immediately succeeds that, which is given in note 17.

Page 156, note (<sup>24</sup>).

Quid est, quod nos miserrimi homines, qui necdum radios promissionis divinæ per fidem comprehendere, aut scintillas præceptorum Dei per opera (ein funklin von Gottes gebotten *und* werken) capere possumus, (quæ utraque verbis et miraculis ipse de cælo confirmavit,) tamen impuri et infirmi rapimur ad comprehendendam *majestatem solaris lucis*, immo *incomprehensibilis lucis* mirabilium Dei? An ignoramus, quod lucem habitat inaccessibilem; et tamen accedimus, immo *præsumamus* accedere? Ignoramus judicia ejus *impenetrabilia*; et tamen *perscrutari* conamur? Et hæc facimus, antequam radiis promissionis et scintillis præceptorum perfusi et imbuti sumus, (berichter und begossen) cum talpinis oculis irruentes in majestatem lucis istius, quæ nec verbis nec signis demonstratur, immo *occultata et non significata* est. (Das nicht mit Worten noch Zeichen angezeigt, sondern heimlich im verborgen bedeutet ist.) Quid mirum, si obruat nos gloria, dum *scrutamur majestatem*? Anno 1530. Lutheri Epist. apud Seckend. lib. ii. sect. 13. §. 43. et apud Aurifab. p. 38.



---

## NOTES

### ON SERMON VIII,

*Page 157, note (¹).*

“QUOS elegit, hos et vocavit.”) Attexit splendidissimam amplificationem de conservatione Ecclesiæ in hac tanta deformitate, et in his confusionibus et ruinis regnorum ; quasi dicat, quanquam omnia minantur interitum, tamen scitote, Ecclesiam curæ esse Deo, et non interiturum esse. Oreditur igitur ab electione, ut nos commonefaciat *de perpetuo consilio Dei*, et *de conservatione Ecclesiæ*, quasi dicat, Scitote, *esse Ecclesiam electam propter Filium*, sicut in Psalmo dicitur, “Fines ceciderunt mihi in præclaris.” Semper aliqua hæreditas erit Filii Dei in genere humano. Et hæc electa Ecclesia prædicatione colligitur, et fit iusta, et ornabitur æterna gloria. Mox igitur monet, *ubi electi querendi sint*, scilicet, *in cœtu vocatorum*. Ideo inquit, “Quos elegit, hos et vocavit.” Melanct. Opera, vol. iv. p. 154.

Hæc dilectio in promissione revelata est, quæ affirmat, Deum semper collecturum esse *Ecclesiam*, quæ in tota æternitate fruatur ejus vita, luce, justitia, et lætitia, juxta dictum, “Portæ inferorum non prævalebunt adversus eam.” Ibid. p. 157.

*Page 158, note (²).*

See Serm. VII. note 18,

*Page*

Page 161, note (3).

It has frequently been observed, that because this Article speaks only of predestination to life, being totally silent upon the subject of reprobation, even those, who wish to give it an interpretation favourable to Calvin's system, must at least admit, that it is defective in one very essential part of that system. But another deviation, if not a manifest difference, perhaps of greater importance, occurs likewise at the outset. In the Institute it is said, "*Prædestinationem vocamus æternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit, quid de unoquoque homine fieri vellet.*" Lib. iii, cap. 21. sect. 5. Here the effect of God's predestinating decree is plainly asserted to be the decision of every man's individual fate. Our Church, on the other hand, as plainly asserts it to be the salvation of Christians, or a liberation from the consequences of transgression, and an adduction to eternal life, through Christianity, of those, who are chosen *out of the human race*, "*ex hominum genere.*" Can we doubt the source or tendency of the expressions, "*quos elegit ex hominum genere,*" when we recollect the frequent recurrence of language almost similar, and of an idea precisely the same, in the writings of Melancthon? Thus in the Loci Theologici; "*Quod Pater æternus. . . . in genere humano . . . . elegerit sibi Ecclesiam.*" Art. de Deo, p. 22. "*Recte dicitur causam electionis esse misericordiam in voluntate Dei, qui non vult perire totum genus humanum, sed propter Filium colligit et servat Ecclesiam. . . . Sed tamen in accipiente concurrere oportet apprehensionem promissionis, seu agnitionem Christi. Nam ideo electi sumus, quia efficitur membra Christi.*" Ibid. p. 473. And again, in a passage already alluded to: "*Revelavit arcanum decretum de remissione peccatorum propter Filium, et colligit*"

“colligit tibi *ex tam corrupta massa humani generis* Ecclesiam.” Disput. Luth. Opera, vol. ii. p. 505.

In the subsequent part of the Article, which speaks of a call to Christianity, we should observe, that this call is not said to be attended with the influence of the Holy Spirit, operating without control in God’s appointed time, (upon a principle of absolute election,) but operating at a favourable period, when, and when only, in the case of adults at least, by the cooperation of man’s will, it can prove effectual. The call, then, by the Spirit, it should be noticed, is not limited to a predetermined, but the working of the Spirit to a proper, season; the former being general in its nature, the latter, necessarily, particular in its effects, in proportion to the resistance or compliance of the human mind. Had the words been, “illi Spiritu ejus *suo*” or “*præfinito* tempore vocantur,” a different sense might indeed have been given to them: but as they now stand, “illi Spiritu ejus *opportuno* tempore *operante* vocantur,” the construction pointed out seems to be the most correct, because it is most consistent with the doctrine of our Church in other respects, (see p. 105.) as well as with the obvious meaning of the terms themselves, and because we cannot easily conceive, how one period is more adapted than another to the influences of God’s Holy Spirit, without admitting, at the same time, the free agency of man.

Nor, when we find our Reformers alluding to *a call by the Spirit*, let us start at the mere sound of an expression, rational in itself, although abused in the grossest manner by a modern enthusiasm. They certainly are exempt from the charge of having, even innocently, laid the foundation of such an abuse. For with Calvin they taught not *a call by the Spirit*, which only takes place at some predestined moment, and, when  
once

once effected, imprints a character on the soul never after to be obliterated ; but, on the contrary, believed that call to prove always efficacious, when unopposed, and yet to leave not a trace behind it, when subsequently rendered void by contumacy and crime. Thus, according to them, every child is called by the Spirit in Baptism, and effectually called, to a state of salvation ; but every child does not certainly continue in that state unto his life's end. Church Catechism.

Page 163, note (\*).

In the passage relative to the consolation derivable from our election in Christ, I have followed the Latin original, where the English translation manifestly deviates from it. The latter is thus worded: "As the  
 "godly consideration of our predestination and elec-  
 "tion in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeak-  
 "able comfort to godly persons, . . . as well because  
 "it doth greatly establish and confirm *their* faith of  
 "eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as  
 "because it doth fervently kindle *their* love towards  
 "God," &c. But in the original the expression is,  
 "fidem *nostram*," and likewise "amorem *nostrum*,"  
 which cannot properly be translated *their* faith, and  
*their* love. Indeed, the pronoun *nos*, in this part of  
 the Article, as I have remarked, seems not to have  
 been adventitiously adopted, the use of it being in-  
 tended to impress the Lutheran idea of an election, as  
 Christians, and not as men, in a character common to  
 us all ; in one, to which confidence in eternal salvation  
 is only attached. "Qui de hoc" (viz. de prædestina-  
 tione) "dubitat," remarks Bucer in his explanation  
 of Melancthon's doctrine, "nec vocatum se et justifi-  
 "catum esse credere poterit, hoc est, nequit esse *Chris-*  
 "*tianus*. Præsumendum igitur, ut principium fidei,  
 "nos omnes a Deo esse præscitos, præfinitos, separatos  
 "a

“a reliquis, et selectos in hoc, ut æternum servemur,  
 “*hocque propositum Dei mutari non posse.*” Enarrat. in  
 Roman. p. 360.

The concluding part of the second clause in this Article is expressed in language, which bears something more than a distant affinity to that of Luther. Alluding to a not unfrequent custom of many presumptuous and abandoned characters in that speculative age, who perpetually resorted to the argument of a divine pre-determination, an argument, which, when constantly kept in view, it terms “*perniciosissimum præcipitium,*” it subjoins, “*Unde illos diabolus protrudit, vel in desperationem, vel in æque perniciosam impurissimæ vitæ securitatem.*” How exactly with this agrees the following observation of Luther; “*E contra ii, qui sentiunt Dei voluntatem non esse, ut omnes salventur, aut in desperationem ruunt, aut in securissimam impietatem dissolvuntur.*” Postill. Domest. p. 58. The sense likewise of the word *præcipitium* evidently appears from the use of it, on another occasion, by the same author: “*His enim avertunt*” (viz. Monachi) “*corda hominum a fide, et communi salutis via, ad sua præcipitia.*” Opera, vol. i. p. 376.

Of the consequences deducible from such an opinion it was impossible for any good man to approve. Calvin therefore, as well as Luther, opposed this monstrous progeny of fatalism; but the more he struggled with it, the more he seemed entangled in the abhorred implications of a system, which sprung from the same origin as his own. In his Institute he thus described the tenets of its numerous and profligate advocates: “*Sunt plerique porci, qui prædestinationis doctrinam impuris istis blasphemiiis conspurcant, atque hoc etiam obtentu admonitiones et objurgationes quasi libet eludunt.*” “*Scit Deus quid de nobis agere*

‘agere semel statuerit. Si salutem decrevit, adducet  
 ‘nos ad eam *suo* tempore : si mortem destinavit, frustra contra tenderemus.’ . . . Ille autem fœdus por-  
 ‘corum grunnitus a Paulo rite compescitur. *Securos*  
 ‘*se in vitiis* pergere dicunt ; quia si sint *e numero elec-*  
 ‘*torum*, nihil obfutura sint vitia, quominus tandem  
 ‘ad vitam perducantur. Atqui in hunc finem elec-  
 ‘tos esse nos Paulus admonet, ut *sanctam ac incul-*  
 ‘*patam* vitam traducamus.” Lib. iii. cap. 23. sect. 10.  
 Such he admitted to have been the conclusion, which profane men too often derived from the doctrine of absolute predestination ; a doctrine, which they zealously supported in theory, but scandalously abused in practice. It is remarkable however, that he censured only one of the two evils resulting from it, *security in vice*, totally omitting the other, *a remediless despair of God’s mercy*, which our Reformers put forward as the most prominent, (vel *in desperationem*, vel  
 “in *æque* perniciosam . . . securitatem,”) and which Luther failed not, on the same occasion, to enumerate in the same order. Was it because he experienced the difficulty of a reply ; because, like them, he could not, consistently with his principles, refute the objection, by urging the universality of grace, and a serious disposition on God’s part to promote the salvation of all men ?

Page 164, note (s).

“Testamentum vetus novo contrarium non est,  
 “quandoquidem tam in veteri, quam in novo, per  
 “Christum, qui unicus est Mediator Dei et hominum,  
 “Deus et homo, æterna vita *humano generi* est propo-  
 “sita.” Art. 7. The generality of the divine promises, as extended to the whole human race, (a position which Calvin denied,) is no less clearly asserted in our Liturgy, than our Articles. And it is singular,  
 that;

that, in a striking instance, our Reformers appear to have introduced it for the express purpose of marking a distinction between his sentiments and their own. The confession at the commencement of our daily service was not, like most of our prayers, taken from the ancient forms, but slightly copied from one originally composed in French by Calvin. See Serm. I. note 7. The plea for mercy, which it contains, stands thus in the Latin translation of Pollanus: "Miserere igitur nostri omnium, O Deus, et Pater clementissime ac misericors, per nomen Filii tui Jesu Christi Domini nostri, te obtestamur:" in that of its author, thus: "Tua igitur nos misericordia dignare Deus, et Pater clementissime, ac summe misericors, in nomine Filii tui Jesu Christi Domini nostri:" but in our own Liturgy a new idea occurs; in which, after the words, "But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us miserable sinners: spare thou them, O God, which confess their sins; restore thou them, that are penitent," are inserted the following; "According to thy promises declared unto mankind in Christ Jesu our Lord;" not the least trace of which is to be found in the Latin. It should likewise be added, that in the absolution immediately subjoined, little more than the name of which appears in Pollanus, another idea, incompatible also with the Calvinistical theory, is discoverable: "Almighty God," it is said, "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who desireth not the death of a sinner, &c."

Page 165, note (6).

The resemblance between the concluding paragraph of this Article, and the constant style of Melancthon upon the same subject, is too great not to be instantly perceived. "Deinde," it is stated, "promissiones divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in sacris literis

“*generaliter* propositæ sunt, et *Dei voluntas* in nostris  
 “*actionibus ea* sequenda est, quam *in verbo Dei* habe-  
 “*mus diserte revelatam.*” If this be compared with  
 the following and other similar passages from Melanc-  
 thon, its origin cannot be doubtful: “*Et si alia subti-*  
 “*liter de electione* disputari fortasse possunt, tamen  
 “*prodest piis tenere, quod promissio sit universalis.*  
 “*Nec debemus de voluntate Dei aliter* judicare, quam  
 “*juxta verbum revelatum,* et scire debemus, quod De-  
 “*us præceperit, ut credamus. . . .* Nos igitur simpli-  
 “*citer interpretamur hanc sententiam universaliter,*  
 “*Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri,*’ scilicet, *quod ad*  
 “*ipsius voluntatem attinet.*” Opera, vol. iv. p. 498,  
 499. “*Hæc universalia dicta de promissione tenea-*  
 “*mus, et opponamus tentationi de particularitate,* cum  
 “*disputant mentes, an sint in numero electorum?* Ab  
 “*hac* disputatione *ad revelatam Dei voluntatem* in  
 “*Evangelio* deducamur, et credamus expresso verbo  
 “*Dei, et nos in universalem promissionem includamus,*  
 “*sciamus eam ad nos quoque pertinere, sciamus Filium*  
 “*Dei veracem nuncium esse, per quem prolata est pro-*  
 “*missio ex sinu æterni Patris, nec fingamus de eadem*  
 “*re contradictorias voluntates in Deo, quia Deus verax*  
 “*est. Hanc consolationem sumptam ex verbo expresso*  
 “*teneamus, nec ipsos inextricabilibus labyrinthis* dispu-  
 “*tationum implicemus, quæ fidem evertunt.*” Vol. iv.  
 p. 86. “*Item Rom. viii. ‘Quos elegit, hos et voca-*  
 “*vit.’ Dulcem, salutarem, et multiplicem consolationem*  
 “*continet hæc sententia. . . .* Secunda consolatio est,  
 “*quod monet hæc sententia non removendam esse vo-*  
 “*cationem a consilio electionis. Elegit Deus, qui vo-*  
 “*care nos ad Filii agnitionem decrevit, et vult generi*  
 “*humano suam voluntatem et sua beneficia innotescere.*  
 “*Approbat igitur et eligit obtemperantes vocationi.*”  
 Loci Theolog. de Prædest. p. 475. See also p. 473.



As nothing of this kind appears in the writings of Calvin, but much in those of Melancthon, can we possibly doubt, to which the eye of our Reformers was directed? It should moreover be observed, that Cranmer was probably induced to draw up this very form upon the topic of predestination by a suggestion of the latter, who, when consulted by him (in the year 1548) respecting the compilation of a public Creed, thus adverted to the subject: “Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio  
 “Stoicæ disputationes apud nostros de fato, et disciplinæ nocuerunt. *Quare te rogo, ut de tali aliqua  
 “formula doctrinæ cogites.*” See Serm. II. note 6. p. 223.

This last clause of the Article has been usually denominated a *caveat*. If by such an expression it be meant, that after having been taught to believe in an absolute, we are required to act upon the principle of a conditional, predestination, there certainly appears a manifest impropriety in the term. For, according to Melancthon, the universality of the divine promises, and that will of God, equally inclined to the salvation of all men, which is truly revealed to us in the word of God, form the principal foundation of the whole system. And indeed, if we turn to the first amended edition of his *Loci Theologici*, we perceive, that he originally inculcated the universality of the Gospel promise, solely with a view to counteract the idea of a particular election upon motives of personal partiality. See Serm. VII. note 22. p. 424.

Perhaps the passage under consideration cannot be better explained, than in language similar to that, in which Bucer expressed Melancthon's leading sentiments. “Furthermore, we must receive” (*embrace, amplecti*) “the promises of God, in such wise as they  
 “are generally set forth to us in holy Scripture,” or,

as they are proposed to us *all* in Scripture, because *all, as Christians, are predestined to salvation*, “and in our doings that will of God is to be followed,” or, and therefore we must not conceive, that God has a secret will respecting us, but *must cooperate with that will of God*, (“et Dei voluntas in nostris actionibus ea sequenda est,”) “which we have expressly declared” (*revealed, revelatam*) “to us in the word of God.”

Page 166, note (<sup>7</sup>).

Consoletur nos in tentatione prædestinationis, quæ vix alia est periculosior, quod promissiones Dei sunt universales *fidelibus*. Confessio Helvetica, de Prædest.

Page 167, note (<sup>8</sup>).

“Wherefore we being thus persuaded of *the good will* of our heavenly Father towards this infant, declared by his Son Jesus Christ, &c.” Office of public Baptism. “Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe, that he *bath* likewise *favourably received* this present infant, that he *bath embraced him with the arms of his mercy*, that he *bath given to him the blessing of eternal life*, and *made him partaker of his everlasting kingdom*.” Office of private Baptism. Editions of 1549 and 1552. An alteration of the tense in the concluding part of the last quotation was afterwards adopted, but not by our Reformers themselves. The words, as they now stand, are; “and (as he has promised in his holy word) *will give unto him the blessing of eternal life*, and *make him partaker of his everlasting kingdom*.” Nothing more seems to have been originally meant by the expressions, “*bath given to him the blessing of eternal life*,” than “*bath given to him a title to the blessing of eternal life*,” and by those which follow, “*made him partaker of his everlasting kingdom*,” than “*made him partaker in a right to the enjoyment of his everlasting kingdom*.” These passages, however,  
appear

appear to have been subsequently understood, as if referring to an actual possession, and perhaps on that account solely were at length altered.

*Page 167, note (°).*

In the prayer after Baptism, every child is expressly declared to be regenerated: "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee *to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit*, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy Church." And in the Office of private Baptism it is unreservedly stated, that he "is now by the laver of regeneration in Baptism *received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life.*" That all baptized children are not nominally, but really, the elect of God, our Church Catechism likewise distinctly asserts. *Q.* "Who gave you that name? *A.* My Godfathers and Godmothers in my Baptism, wherein I was made a *member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven. . . . I learn to believe in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God.*"

Nor is the position, that an actual regeneration always takes place, confined to our Baptismal service, but also subsequently recognized in the Order of Confirmation, the first prayer of which thus commences: "Almighty and everliving God, who hast vouchsafed *to regenerate these thy servants by water, and the Holy Ghost, &c.*" Surely it requires something more than a common share of ingenuity to pervert language like this from its plain, grammatical sense, into one directly repugnant. See p. 372. for the doctrine of our Homilies on the same point.

*Page 167, note (1°).*

No man, perhaps, was ever less scrupulous in the  
F f 3
adoption

adoption of general expressions, but, perhaps, no man adopted them with more mental reservations, than Calvin. To his conduct in this particular, upon the point of Baptismal efficacy, I have already alluded in Serm. III. note 16. With such a disposition, however, he certainly was very sparing in his use of them, when he composed his office of Baptism. He indeed admitted, that the children of Christians are included with their parents in the Covenant of Christianity; but this he asserted to be the case *without* Baptism, and considered as solely applicable to an *external* Covenant. Hence the assembly of Divines, in their celebrated Directory of 1644, who almost literally translated his language, and correctly expressed his meaning, directed the minister to shew “. . . . that the promise is made to believers, and their seed, and that the seed and posterity of the faithful, born within the Church, have, by their birth, interest in the Covenant, and right to the *seal* of it, and to the *outward* privileges of the Church. . . . That children by Baptism are solemnly received into the bosom of the *visible* Church, &c.” Directory, p. 22. ed. 1546. With Calvin’s principle therefore, that, although *all* children are outwardly incorporated into Christ’s Church, *some* only are inwardly regenerated by the Spirit, the following declaration in our Baptismal service is utterly inconsistent: “Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child *is regenerated*, and grafted into the body of Christ’s Church;” words, which unequivocally convey the idea of a participation as well in the internal, as in the external, privileges of the Gospel Covenant. *When* regeneration is supposed to take place, according to his creed, we learn from the Articles of Concord between the Churches of Zurich and Geneva, drawn up in the year 1549, which observe;

observe; "*Qui in prima infantia baptizati sunt, eos in pueritia, vel ineunte adolescentia, interdum etiam in senectute, regenerat Deus.*" Art. 20. Opusc. p. 1038. These were the Articles of Concord, which gave so much offence to Melancthon, (see Serm. VII. note 20.) and one of which he indignantly erased from the copy shewn to him. Nor is it difficult, perhaps, to point out the offensive passage. That it was the following seems almost certain, because no other relates to the subject of predestination: "*Præterea sedulo docemus, Deum non promiscue vim suam exercere in omnibus, qui Sacramenta recipiunt, sed tantum in electis. Nam quemadmodum non alios in fidem illuminat, quam quos præordinavit ad vitam, ita arcana Spiritus sui virtute efficit, ut percipiant electi, quæ offerunt Sacramenta.*" Art. 16.

The full extent, then, of Calvin's charity on this occasion, it is not difficult to estimate. What that of Beza's subsequently was, who imbibed all the spirit, but not all the prudence, of his master, appears from a public conference, which he held with the Lutherans in the year 1586. "*Idem,*" he then remarked, "*in Baptismo fit, quem multa millia infantum accipiunt, qui tamen nunquam regenerantur, sed in æternum pereunt.*" Acta Colloquii Montisbell. p. 393. ed. 1613.

Page 168, note (<sup>11</sup>).

In the year 1543, Melancthon and Bucer drew up a reformed Liturgy, and with it an exposition of several controverted points of faith, for the use of the Archbishopric of Cologne. From this work the occasional services of our own Church, where they vary from the ancient forms, seem principally to have been derived. It was not, however, itself original, but in a great degree borrowed from a Liturgy previously established at

Norimberg. This appears from the epistles of Melancthon. "Scripsi vobis antea, Episcopum secutum esse *formam Norimbergensem*. Eratque ante meum adventum institutus liber, *ad exemplum Norimbergense*. Retinuit pleraque Bucerus; quosdam Articulos auxit, ut est copiosus. *Mibi*, cum omnia reliquissim, attribuit Articulos *περὶ τριῶν ὑποστάσεων*, de creatione, de peccato originis, de justitia fidei et operum, de Ecclesia, de pœnitentia. In his consumpsi tempus hæcenus, et legi de cæremoniis Baptismi, et cœnæ Domini, quæ ipse composuit. Arbitror pæne finitum esse opus." Ep. p. 546. "Postquam veni Bonnam, intellexi Episcopum dedisse mandatum, ut forma doctrinæ et rituum proponenda Ecclesiis conscribatur, et quidem *ad exemplum Norimbergensis formæ*." M. Luthero, Ibid. p. 91. It should be observed, that the author of the Reformation at Norimberg was not Osiander, but Wincellaus Lincus, who settled there in the year 1525. Gerdes, Introductio, vol. i. p. 243.

All our Offices bear evident marks of having been partly taken from this work; liberally imitating, but not servilely copying it. In our Baptismal service the resemblance between the two productions is particularly striking; nor in the Cologne form is the doctrine of universal regeneration and election in Baptism less prominent, than in our own. The sense of the following passages cannot easily be mistaken. "Baptismus est Sacramentum regenerationis, quo Christo Domino inferimur, incorporamur, sepelimur in mortem ejus, induimur eo, et efficimur per eum *fili* et *hæredes Dei*." Nostra *Hermanni*, &c. simplex ac pia Deliberatio, &c. p. 69. ed. 1545. "Sed Deus Pater, pro ineffabili sua misericordia *erga genus humanum*, Filium suum misit, ut mundum servaret, *quare etiam*

" et

“ et *hos infantes servatos vult*. Ille peccata totius mun-  
 “ di tulit, et tam parvulos, quam nos adultos, a pecca-  
 “ tis, morte, diabolo, et æterna damnatione liberavit,  
 “ et salvos fecit, qui voluit sibi offerri parvulos, ut iis  
 “ benedictionem impartiretur. Quare pro immensa  
 “ Christiana pietate vestra *hunc puerum* assumite, et ad  
 “ Christum adducite, et offerre piis vestris precibus,  
 “ quo peccatorum suorum ab illo consequatur remis-  
 “ sionem, transferatur in regnum gratiæ, ereptus e ty-  
 “ rannide Satanæ, et constituatur *hæres æternæ salutis*.  
 “ Et vobis certissimum sit, Dominum nostrum Jesum Chris-  
 “ tum hoc opus charitatis vestræ erga hunc infantem cle-  
 “ mentissime respecturum.” p. 71. “ Wherefore we being  
 “ thus persuaded of the good will of our heavenly Father  
 “ towards this infant, declared by his Son Jesus Christ, and  
 “ nothing doubting, but that he favourably alloweth this  
 “ charitable work of ours, &c.” “ His verbis et huic  
 “ facto Domini nostri Jesu Christi super illos *fidem ha-*  
 “ *bete, nec dubitate eum et vestros infantes sic in sacro*  
 “ *baptismate suscepturum, et complexurum esse ulnis miseric-*  
 “ *ordix sue, et benedictionem vitæ æternæ, et sempi-*  
 “ *ternam regni Dei communionem iis collaturum.*” p. 72.  
 “ Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe, that he  
 “ will likewise favourably receive this present infant;  
 “ that he will embrace him with the arms of his mercy;  
 “ that he will give unto him the blessing of eternal life;  
 “ and make him partaker of his everlasting kingdom.”  
 “ Itaque ex baptismate certo statuimus, nos Deo accep-  
 “ tos et foedere gratiæ sempiterno ei conjunctos esse.”  
 p. 72. “ Debent pastores subinde accuratius et soli-  
 “ dius explicare et excutere *ratum* habere Deum *bap-*  
 “ *tisma infantium nostrorum*, infantes per baptismum  
 “ *adoptare in filios, et constituere hæredes gratiæ suæ et*  
 “ *vitæ æternæ.*” p. 75. “ Quod cum fecerint, ne du-  
 “ bitent infantem suum vere baptizatum, peccatis ablu-  
 “ tum,

“*tum, in Christo renatum, et filium hæredemque Dei factum esse.*” p. 77. “*Ex his ergo Christi verbis certi sumus infantes, quicumque Christo juxta verbum ejus offeruntur, pertinere ad regnum Dei, esse filios Dei, membra Christi.*” Ibid. “*Hunc igitur infantulum filium et hæredem Dei, fratrem et cohæredem Christi, membrum Christi, et vestrum in Christo, &c.*” p. 78.

That these passages express something more than the language of hope, will not, perhaps, be controverted. It should however be recollected, that when the Lutherans spoke thus certainly of the regeneration and election of *every* infant in Baptism, they attributed nothing to the Sacramental efficacy, but all to the divine promise. Hence our Church strongly urges that promise, as the sure and only ground of our confidence. “*Dearly beloved, ye have brought this child to be baptized; ye have prayed, that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive him, to release him of his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, to give him*” (a title to) “*the kingdom of Heaven and everlasting life. Ye have heard also, that our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised in his Gospel to grant all these things, that ye have prayed for; which promise he for his part will most surely keep and perform.*” In the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* likewise this point is directly noticed: “*Plures item,*” it is there observed, “*ab aliis cumulantur errores in Baptismo, quem aliqui sic attoniti spectant, ut ab ipso illo externo credant elemento Spiritum Sanctum emergere, vimque ejus nomen et virtutem, ex qua recreamur, et gratiam et reliqua ex eo proficiscentia dona in ipsis Baptismi fonticulis enatare.*” In summa totam regenerationem nostram illi sacro puteo deberi volunt, qui in sensus nostros incurrunt.

“*Verum*



“ Verum salus animarum, instaurationis Spiritus, et beneficium adoptionis, quo nos Deus *pro filiis* agnoscit, a misericordia divina per Christum ad nos dimanante, tum etiam *ex promissione* sacris in Scripturis apparente, proveniunt.” Cap. de Baptismo.

Page 168, note (12).

It is *certain* by God's word, that children, which are baptized, dying before they commit *actual* sin, are *undoubtedly* saved. Rubrick after the Office of public Baptism.

Page 168, note (13).

The work referred to is “ The Institution of a Christian Man,” published in 1537. “ Item, that *the promise of grace and everlasting life* (which promise is adjoined unto this Sacrament of Baptism) pertaineth not only unto such, as have the use of reason, but also to *infants, innocents, and young children*, and that they ought therefore, and must needs be baptized, and that by the Sacrament of Baptism they do also obtain *remission of their sins, the grace and favour of God*, and be made thereby *the very sons of God*. *In so much as infants and children, dying in their infancy, shall undoubtedly be saved thereby*, and else not.” p. 35. The same publication likewise contemplates faith and obedience in maturer years, not as the consequences, but as the causes of election. “ There is, and hath been ever from the beginning of the world, and so shall endure and continue, a certain number, society, communion, or company, of *the elect* and faithful people of God, of which number our Saviour Jesus Christ is the only head and governor, and the members of the same be all these holy saints, which be now in Heaven, and also all the faithful people of God, which be alive, or that ever heretofore have lived, or shall live in this world, from the  
“ begin-

“beginning unto the end of the same, and be ordained, *for their true faith and obedience unto the will of God*, to be saved, and to enjoy everlasting life in “Heaven.” p. 13.

*Page 169, note (14).*

When our Church maintains the actual regeneration of all infants dedicated to Christ in Baptism, it is evident, that at the same time she inculcates the universality of grace. That she equally holds its defectibility, not only follows as a consequence of the preceding position, but is itself distinctly and explicitly alluded to: “Grant, that this child, now to be baptized therein, may receive the fulness of thy grace, and *ever remain* in the number of thy faithful and elect children.” Office of Baptism. “That as he is made partaker of the death of thy Son, he may also be partaker of his resurrection; so that *finally*” (not for a period only) “with the residue of thy holy Church, he may be an inheritor” (or heir) “of thine everlasting kingdom.” The same. “Defend, O Lord, this *thy child* with thy heavenly grace, that he may *continue* thine for ever.” Order of Confirmation.

*Page 171, note (15).*

Although Heaven is the gift of Christianity, and by becoming Christians we become entitled to it, yet are its rewards solely conferred on persevering virtue: “Grant, that whosoever is here dedicated to thee by our office and ministry, may also be endued with *heavenly virtues*, and *everlastingly rewarded*.” Office of Baptism.

*Page 171, note (16).*

The impossibility of reconciling the doctrine contained in our Liturgy and Homilies with the Calvinistical predestination, has been so frequently and ably demonstrated, that a repetition of that argument seems  
unne-

unnecessary. There is, nevertheless, a paragraph in our Burial service, of much importance to the controversy, which I have never seen fully elucidated. It is the following; "Suffer us not, at our last hour, for any pains of death, *to fall from thee.*" The Calvinists endeavour to get rid of the difficulty, which these expressions oppose to their system, by asserting, that they only relate to a fall from a *fictitious* faith. But the contrary appears to be the fact, if we trace them to their real source. The passage, in which they are found, was taken from a German Hymn of Luther, composed as a kind of poetical paraphrase upon another very ancient one in the Offices of the Romish Church. The words of Luther in the latter part of this Hymn are, "Heiliger Herre Gott, heiliger star-ker Gott, heiliger harmbertziger Heyland, du ewiger Gott, laß uns nicht entfallen von des rechten glaubens trost." Geistliches Handbuchlein, p. 136. "O Holy Lord God, O holy mighty God, O holy merciful Saviour, thou God eternal, suffer us not *to fall from the consolation of true faith.*" To ascertain, therefore, the precise meaning of the terms in our own Liturgy, nothing more seems requisite, than to compare them with the original. Indeed, to consider a fall *from God* as meaning a fall from *an ideal faith* in God, is a species of forced interpretation, in itself not easily admissible.

But the language, as well as sentiments, of our Reformers on this occasion, may be further illustrated by the publications of the preceding reign. In the Bishops' Book it is said; "Keep us from the inticements of the devil, that we consent not to any of his temptations or persuasions. Keep us, that he by no suggestion bring us *from the right faith*, neither *cause us to fall into desperation*, now, nor in the point  
" of

“*of death.*” p. 91. And in the King’s Book, thus still more directly to the point. “Whether there be any special, particular knowledge, which man by faith hath certainly of himself, whereby he may testify to himself, that he is of the *predestinates*, which shall to the end persevere in their calling, we have not spoken; nor can in Scripture nor doctors find, that any *such* faith can be taught or preached. Truth it is, that in the Sacraments instituted by Christ we may constantly believe the works of God in them to our present comfort, and application of his grace and favour, with assurance also, that he will not fail us, if we *fall not from him.*” Art. of Faith. “Albeit in this assembly of men called by the word of God, and received by faith and baptism, be many evil men, many sinners, many that turn by true penance to grace, and yet sometimes fall again, some, after they turn by true penance, still persevere, and increase in goodness; many, *that fall*, and *never rise again*, &c.” 9th art. of the Creed. Perhaps likewise a reference to the Creed of Cranmer, respecting the possibility of perishing in the dreadful hour of affliction and death, may not be deemed unimportant. “In this petition (deliver us from evil) we must learn both wisdom and patience: wisdom to beware of sin, when it provoketh us, and in no wise to follow the same; and patience, to suffer willingly the cross, and such afflictions as God shall send unto us, and to pray God with fervent desire, that he *suffer us not to perish in the same*; but mercifully defend us, until such time as it shall please him clearly to deliver us, which shall be, *when we shall die.* . . . At *that* hour we be in the most danger of all evils and temptations. Wherefore it is most necessary for us, even from our tender age, to pray to our Lord, that *at that last hour*

“*be*

“ *he will be good and gracious to us, delivering us from all manner of evil.*” Catechism, p. 210.

Page 171, note <sup>(17)</sup>.

The individual opinions of Cranmer upon the subject of predestination, probably because little known, have been seldom adduced. That he thought very differently from Calvin respecting universal redemption, the extracts, which I have given from his writings in p. 321. will perhaps be admitted as complete evidence, even by those, who may not esteem them fully satisfactory upon the collateral question, for the illustration of which they are there quoted. Neither is it difficult to shew, not only that he further differed from the Reformer of Geneva on the point of final perseverance, but that he held the same doctrine of regeneration and an election in Christ through Baptism, which is so conspicuous in the Offices of our Church. In his Catechism his sentiments are thus delivered: “ And we Christian men, although by *Baptism we be made the children of God, and receive the Holy Ghost, &c.*” p. 192. “ Here we mean a *second birth*, which is *spiritual*, whereby our inward man and mind is renewed of the Holy Ghost, so that our hearts and minds receive new desires, which they had not of their *first* birth or nativity. And *the second birth* is by the water of *Baptism*, which Paul calleth the laver of regeneration, because our sins be forgiven us in Baptism, and *the Holy Ghost* is *poured into us*, as into *God’s beloved children*, so that by the power and working of the Holy Ghost we are born again spiritually, and made new creatures. And so by *Baptism* we enter into the kingdom of God, and shall be saved for ever, *if we continue to our lives’ end* in the faith of Christ.” p. 214. When speaking of adults, he observes, “ All these benefits  
“ we

"we receive by faith, in the which *whosoever continu-*  
 " *eth unto the end of his life* shall be saved; the which  
 " *God grant to us all.*" p. 121. "Take this for a sure  
 " conclusion, and doubt nothing thereof, that the Holy  
 " Ghost, as he hath *begun* these things in us, so he  
 " will *finish* the same, *if we obey him, and continue in*  
 " *faith unto the end of our lives.* For he that *continueth*  
 " *unto the end* shall be saved." p. 143. Such were his  
 ideas, when our Liturgy was first compiled; and that  
 they were not afterwards changed, when he became a  
 Zuinglian on the point of the Sacramental presence, we  
 may conclude from the last of his productions, his an-  
 swer to Gardiner, in which he says; "For this cause  
 " Christ ordained Baptism in water, that, as surely as  
 " we feel and touch the water, so assuredly ought we  
 " to believe, when we are baptized, that Christ is  
 " verily present with us, and that by him we be *newly*  
 " *born again spiritually*, and washed from our sins, and  
 " grafted in the stock of Christ's own body, and be ap-  
 " pareled, clothed, and harnessed with him in such  
 " wise, that as the devil hath no power against Christ,  
 " so hath he none against us, *so long as we remain*  
 " *grafted in that stock, and be clothed with that apparel,*  
 " *and be harnessed with that armour.*" p. 38. "The Holy  
 " Ghost doth not only come to us in Baptism, and Christ  
 " doth there clothe us, but they do the same to us con-  
 " tinually, *so long as we dwell in Christ.*" p. 71.

Upon the same points, the universality and defectibili-  
 ty of grace, points utterly incompatible with the Cal-  
 vinistical theory, Latimer seems to have spoken no less  
 decidedly, than Cranmer. On the first head he adopt-  
 ed the following unambiguous mode of expression.  
 "The promises of Christ our Saviour are *general*; they  
 " pertain to *all mankind.* He made a general procla-  
 " mation, saying, 'Whosoever believeth in me hath  
 " ever-

‘everlasting life!’ Likewise St. Paul saith; ‘The grace and mercies of God exceed far our sins.’ “Therefore let us ever think and believe, that the grace of God, his mercy and goodness, exceedeth our sins. Also consider, what Christ saith with his own mouth; ‘Come to me, *all* ye, that labour, and are laden, and I will ease you.’ Mark here he saith, ‘Come *all* ye;’ wherefore then should any man despair; to shut out himself from these promises of Christ, which be *general*, and pertain *to the whole world?*” Sermons, p. 182. ed. 1584. “Now seeing, that the Gospel is *universal*, it appeareth, that he would have *all mankind* saved, and that the fault is not in *him*, if we be damped. For it is written thus; ‘God would have *all* men to be saved.’ His salvation is sufficient to save all mankind; but we are so wicked of ourselves, that we *refuse* the same, and we *will not take* it, when it is offered unto us; and *therefore* he saith; ‘Few are chosen.’ p. 327. Is it possible for any man at all conversant with the writings of Luther and Melancthon on one side, and with those of Calvin on the other, to hesitate in determining, from which the preceding language was derived? Nor was he deficient in precision upon the second head. On this he remarked, “I do not put you in comfort that if you have *once* the Spirit, ye cannot lose it. There be *new* spirits started up now of late, that say, *after* we have received the Spirit, *we cannot sin*. I will make but one argument. St. Paul had brought the Galatians to the profession of the faith, and left them in that state. They had received the Spirit *once*, and they *sinned again*. . . . . If this be true, we may *lose* the Spirit, that we have once possessed. It is a *fond* thing, I will not tarry in it.” p. 84. “Who- soever purposely sinneth, contra conscientiam, against

“ his conscience, he *batb lost* the Holy Ghost, the remission of sins, and *finally Christ himself.*” p. 170. “ As there be many of us, which, when we fall willingly into sin against conscience, we lose *the favour of God, our salvation, and finally the Holy Ghost.*” p. 226. “ That man or woman, that committeth such an act, loseth the Holy Ghost, and the remission of sins, and so becometh the *child of the Devil*, being before the *child of God . . . .* Now he that is led so with sin, he is *in the state of damnation*, and sinneth *damnably.*” P. 227. “ We may one time be *in* the book, and another time come *out* again, as it appeareth by David, which was written in the book of life. But when he sinned, he at that same time was *out* of the book of the favour of God, until he had repented, and was sorry for his faults. So *we* may be *in* the book at one time, and afterward, when we forget God, and his word, and do wickedly, we come *out* of the book, that is *out of Christ*, who is the book.” p. 312.

*Page 172, note (18).*

An eminent Calvinistical controversialist of the present day makes the following concession respecting the opinion of Hooper upon predestination. “ Your next quotation is from Bishop Hooper, and in this single point, it is *clearly* on your side of the question.” Goliath slain, p. 10.

The quotations from the writings of Hooper have been generally taken from the preface to his Declaration of the Ten Commandments, which seems to have been composed, like the 17th Article of our Church, not to encourage, but repress, all vain speculation, upon what he terms “ the disputation of God’s providence,” which he censures as “ *a curiosity, and no religion, a presumption, and no faith, a let of virtue and a furtherance of vice.*” p. 89.



p. 89. In this preface the subsequent passages, which define the causes of election and reprobation, (the leading points of the controversy,) are verbally translated from Melancthon. "The *cause* of reprobation or damnation "is *sin in man*, which *will not* hear, neither receive the "promise of the Gospel. . . . This sentence is *true*, "howsoever man may judge of predestination. *God* is "not the *cause* of sin, nor *would have* man to sin. "Thou art not the God, that willeth sin." Psalm v. 4. "And it is said; 'Thy perdition, O Israel, is of thy- "self, and thy succour only of me.' Hos. xiii. 9. Cau- "sam reprobationis certum est hanc esse, videlicet pec- "catum in hominibus, qui prorsus non audiunt, nec "accipiunt, Evangelium. . . . In his certum est, cau- "sam esse reprobationis peccatum ipsorum, et humanam "voluntatem. Nam verissima est sententia, Deum non "esse causam peccati, nec velle peccatum. Nota est enim "vox Psalmi: 'Non Deus volens iniquitatem tu es.' "Et Hos. xiii. dicitur; 'Perditio tua est Israel. Tan- "tum in me auxilium tuum est.' Loci Theolog. de "præd. p. 472. The cause of our election is the mer- "cy of God in Christ. Howbeit he that will be par- "taker of this election, must receive the promise in "Christ by faith, for *therefore* we be elected, *because* "afterward we are made the members of Christ. "Therefore as in the justification and remission of sin, "there is a *cause*, though no *dignity* at all in the re- "ceiver of his justification, and so we judge him by "the Scripture to be justified and have remission of his "sin, because he received the grace promised in Christ; "so we judge of election, by the event or success, "that happeneth in the life of man, those only to "be elected, that by faith apprehend the mercy pro- "mised in Christ." "Recte dicitur, causam electionis "esse misericordiam in voluntate Dei. . . . Sed tamen

“ in accipiente concurrere oportet apprehensionem pro-  
 “ missionis, seu agnitionem Christi. Nam *ideo* electi  
 “ sumus, *quia* efficimur membra Christi. Ergo in ius-  
 “ tificatione diximus aliquam esse in accipiente, *causam*,  
 “ non *dignitatem*, sed quia promissionem apprehendit,  
 “ . . . . ita de electione a posteriore iudicamus, videlicet  
 “ haud dubie electos esse eos, qui misericordiam propter  
 “ Christum promissam fide apprehendunt.” Ib. p. 473.  
 “ John saith, ‘ No man cometh to me, except my Father  
 “ draw him.’ Many men understand these words in a  
 “ wrong sense, as though God required in a reasona-  
 “ ble man no more than in a dead post, and marketh  
 “ not the words that follow ; ‘ Every man that hear-  
 “ eth and learneth of my Father cometh to me.’ God  
 “ draweth with his word and the Holy Ghost, but  
 “ *man’s duty* is to hear and learn, that is to say, *receive*  
 “ the grace offered, *consent* to the promise, and not *re-*  
 “ *pugn* the God, that calleth.” “ Sic cum Joan. vi. dic-  
 “ tum esset, ‘ Nemo venit ad me, nisi Pater traxerit  
 “ eum,’ sequitur statim, ‘ Omnis, qui audit a Patre, et  
 “ discit, venit ad me.’ Oritur Deus, et trahit verbo  
 “ suo, et Spiritu Sancto, sed *audire nos oportet, et disce-*  
 “ *re*, id est, apprehendere promissionem, et *assentiri, non*  
 “ *repugnari.*” Ib. Nor was the principal object, which  
 Hooper proposed to himself in this adoption of Me-  
 lanchthon’s ideas, at all obscure ; for in the sentence  
 immediately preceding the first quotation he observes,  
 that it is not the Christian’s part “ to say God hath  
 “ written fatal laws, as the *Stoic*, and with *necessity* of  
 “ *destiny* violently *pulleth one man by the hair into hea-*  
 “ *ven*, and *thrusteth the other headlong into hell:*” and  
 then adds, therefore “ ascertain thyself by the *Scrip-*  
 “ *ture* what be the causes of reprobation and what of  
 “ election. The cause of reprobation, &c.” as before.  
 But in a prior part of the same preface he more fully  
 explains

explains the scope of his whole reasoning. "As the  
 " sins of Adam," he remarks, "without privilege or  
 " exception extended unto all and every of Adam's  
 " posterity, so did *the promise of grace* generally apper-  
 " tain as well *to every and singular* of Adam's posterity,  
 " as to Adam. . . . St. Paul doth by collation of Adam  
 " and Christ, sin and grace, thus interpret God's pro-  
 " mise, and maketh not *Christ inferior to Adam, nor*  
 " *grace to sin*. If *all* then shall be saved, what is to be  
 " said of those that Peter speaketh of, that shall perish  
 " for their false doctrine? And likewise Christ saith;  
 " that the gate is strait that leadeth to life, and few  
 " enter.' Thus the Scripture answereth, that the pro-  
 " mise of grace appertaineth to every sort of men in  
 " the world; and comprehendeth them all, howbeit  
 " *within certain limits and bounds*, the which if men  
 " neglect or *pass over*, they *exclude themselves* from the  
 " promise in Christ; as Cain was no more excluded,  
 " *till he excluded himself*, than Abel, Saul than David,  
 " Judas than Peter, Esau than Jacob. By the Scrip-  
 " ture it seemeth, that the sentence of God was given  
 " to save the one, and damn the other, before the one  
 " loved God, or the other hated God. Howbeit these  
 " threatenings of God against Esau, if he had not of  
 " *his own wilful malice* excluded himself from the pro-  
 " mise of grace, should no more have hindered his  
 " salvation, than God's threatenings *against Nineveh*,  
 " which, notwithstanding that God said should be de-  
 " stroyed within 40 days, stood a great time after, and  
 " did penance." Hence it appears, that he supposed the  
 " will of God to be conditional, which indeed he else-  
 " where avowed in direct terms. "That God repent-  
 " eth of the evil he purposed to do unto the Ninevites,  
 " we learn, that all the threatenings of God be *condi-*  
 " *tionally*, that is to say, to fall upon us, if we repent  
 " not

“not of our evil deeds.” Sermons on Jonas, Sermon 7.  
 “Such as be sanctified by Christ, must live an honest  
 “and holy life, or else his sanctification availeth not;  
 “as God forsook the children of Israel, so will he do  
 “us; they were elected to be his people *upon this con-*  
*dition*; ‘Si audiendo audieris vocem meam, et  
 ‘custodieris pactum meum, eris mihi peculium de  
 ‘cunctis populis.’ He that favoured not the Israel-  
 “ites, but took cruel vengeance upon them, because  
 “they walked not in their vocation, will do, and  
 “doth daily the same unto us. Therefore one of these  
 “two we must needs do; that say we be justified and  
 “sanctified in Christ, either from the bottom of our  
 “hearts amend, or else be eternally lost, with all our  
 “ghostly knowledge.” A Declaration of Christ and his  
 Office, cap. 10.

It is recorded both by Fox and Strype, that violent disputes upon the subject of predestination took place between the Protestant prisoners, (particularly those in the King's Bench,) during the persecution of Mary. The particulars of these disputes, it is generally supposed, are now lost. The contrary, however, appears to be the case; for in the Bodleian Library there is a small Quarto Manuscript, (No. 1972. MSS. Cat.) which contains a considerable portion, at least, of the controversy on both sides. As the circumstance is singular and curious, and as the precise opinions of the moderate party seem never to have been made public, I shall subjoin a few extracts from their own statements. At one period there was a disposition to sign general terms of concord; upon which occasion Trew, the leader of the Anti-Predestinarians, drew up Articles of Unity, the 4th and 6th of which we find thus expressed: “4. Also we confess, and believe, and  
 “faithfully acknowledge, that all salvation, justifica-  
 “tion,

tion, redemption, and remission of sins, cometh unto  
 us wholly and solely through the mere mercy and  
 favour of God in Jesus Christ, purchased unto us  
 through his most precious death and bloodshedding,  
 and in no part through any of our own merit,  
 works, or deservings, how many or how good soever  
 they be; and that his body was offered to the death  
 once on the cross for all the sins of Adam, and *for*  
*all and singular of his posterity's sins*, how great and  
 many soever they be; and that all, that truly re-  
 pent, unfeignedly believe with a lively faith, and  
 persevere therein to the end of this mortal life,  
 shall be saved, and *that there is no decree of God to the*  
*contrary*. . . . 6. Also we do heartily acknowledge,  
 confess, and believe, and are most assuredly certain-  
 ed by God's most holy word, that our Lord Jesus  
 Christ's pure religion, and secret will, revealed in his  
 word, sufficient for man's salvation, was in this realm  
 declared and known in good King Edward the VIth's  
 days, which word of God was then truly preached  
 and sufficiently taught, and his Sacraments duly mi-  
 nistered, and of some followed; therefore we acknow-  
 ledge them in England, Christ's true Church visi-  
 ble." MSS. p. 124. These Articles, which are given  
 in a short tract, written by Trew, respecting "the  
 cause of contention in the King's Bench, as con-  
 cerning the Sects of Religion, the 30th of January,  
 Ann. Dom. 1555." although intended for mutual  
 subscription, were nevertheless not subscribed by the  
 Predestinarians, who are, on that account, accused of a  
 breach of promise. In the relation of particulars, the  
 writer bitterly inveighs against the principles and con-  
 duct of the other side, who, he remarks, so interpreted  
 those texts of Scripture, which warn all who *are*, no  
 less than all who are *not*, in the favour of God, as if  
 they

they were only “written to put the elect in fear to do  
 “evil, that their lives might glorify their Father,  
 “which is in heaven, and not to put them in fear of  
 “damnation. By this, in effect,” he adds; “they af-  
 “firmed those Scriptures to be written in vain, or to  
 “put men in fear, where no fear is; *affirming in effect,*  
 “that the words of the Holy Ghost do no more good,  
 “*than a man of clouts, with a bow in his hand, doth in*  
 “a corn field, which will keep away the vermin crows  
 “awhile; but when they know it, what it is, they  
 “will fall down beside it, and devour the corn without  
 “fear.” p. 117. He then shortly states his own lead-  
 ing sentiments, and those of his friends, which had  
 given so much offence to the Predestinarian party, and  
 produced such unhappy divisions. “For we, that  
 “do hold and affirm the truth, *that Christ died for all*  
 “*men*, we do by the holy Scripture satisfy every man,  
 “that doth repent, and unfeignedly believe with a  
 “lively faith, (that he) is in the state of salvation, and  
 “one of God’s elect children, and shall *certainly* be  
 “saved, *if* he do not with malice of heart utterly for-  
 “sake God; . . . and as long as he feeleth repent-  
 “ance and hope, and that he hath a will desirous to  
 “do God’s will, he is under the promise of life, made  
 “by God the Father, in and through his Son Jesus  
 “Christ, who hath *fulfilled* that, which *was lacking on*  
 “*his part*. So that he, that through God’s gift and  
 “assistance *do continue to the end*, he shall be saved,  
 “though all men in earth, and devils in hell, say and  
 “do what they can to the contrary. *This certainty* of  
 “our election is sure and agreeable to the word, but  
 “that, which they hold, is not. Wherefore we durst  
 “not, for our lives and souls, forsake this undoubted  
 “truth, and grant that, which they by the word can-  
 “not approve to be true. For *these aforesaid causes,*  
 “and

“ *and none other*, they did evil us, rail on us, and call  
 “ us heretics, cast dust in our faces, and give sentence  
 “ of damnation on us, and excommunicated us, and  
 “ would neither eat nor drink with us, nor yet bid us  
 “ God speed, and did keep away such money, as was  
 “ given them in common to distribute among us, that  
 “ did lie for the truth, and caused us to be locked up,  
 “ that we should speak to nobody by their minds, lest  
 “ we should warn them of their false and erroneous  
 “ opinion, . . . and for no other cause, but that our  
 “ conscience, grounded on God’s word, would not  
 “ suffer us to be *of that sect.*” p. 119.

We see by these Articles of Unity the utmost latitude of expression, which the Anti-Predestinarians deemed admissible. By the following we perceive, with what very heavy “enormities” (as they termed it) they thought the opposite doctrine to be justly chargeable. “1st Enormity. That this foul and abominable error of the Manichees sect, or imagined predestination, is most *odious against God*, for in that it affirmeth, God ordained and created reprobates, and hardened their hearts *only to do evil*, it approveth contrary to the truth, that there is *a nature or motion to evil in God*; for it is written, as the workman is, such is the work. 2. Also in that it affirmeth, that God ordained some to be saved, the residue to be damned, before any of them had done good or evil, *it maketh God partial.* 3. Also it maketh *God* the author of all the sin and abomination, that is done or committed on the earth, and clean chargeth *the devil and man* thereof; in that it affirmeth, that he ordained and created those that commit it for that *only* purpose, the which *they cannot avoid.* . . . 6. Also in that it affirmeth, that Christ died not for *all* men, it defaceth *the dignity, efficacy,*

“and *virtue* of his passion. 7. Also it maketh *Christ*  
 “*inferior to Adam*, in that it affirmeth, that he died  
 “not for as many as Adam damned. 8. Also it mak-  
 “eth *grace inferior to sin*, in that it affirmeth, that the  
 “grace in Christ was not of power to save *all* them,  
 “that sin damned. . . . . 12. Also it causeth many to  
 “live *at free chance careless*, in that it teacheth them,  
 “that they were elected or reprobated before the  
 “foundations of the world were laid; and if they be  
 “so, that they *cannot fall*; and if they be not, that  
 “*their weeping will not help*. . . . 15. Also it destroyeth  
 “the *certainty* of our election, and is enough to drive  
 “all such as believe it *to despair*, for lack of know-  
 “ledge, whether Christ died for them, or not. . . . .  
 “17. Also it doth put away and make frustrate the  
 “greatest part and principallest point of the fear of  
 “God, in that in effect it affirmeth, that none of those,  
 “that are *predestinate and elect*, can ever more *finally*  
 “*perish*, do what sin and wickedness they can. . . . .  
 “19. Also it maketh God a mocker, in that it affirm-  
 “eth, that he *offereth* faith to such, who, he knoweth,  
 “*cannot receive it*.” p. 119.

Such were the sentiments of those, who at that pe-  
 riod rejected the doctrine of absolute predestination.  
 And even among its advocates, that one at least of  
 the most respectable of them was not disposed to go  
 the whole length of the Calvinistical system, the sub-  
 sequent quotation from Bradford seems to prove:  
 “God’s *fore-sight* is not the cause of sin, or excusable  
 “necessity to him that sinneth. The damned there-  
 “fore have not, nor shall have, any excuse, because  
 “God, *foreseeing* their condemnation *through their*  
 “*own sin*, did not draw them, as he doth his elect,  
 “unto Christ; but as the elect have cause to thank  
 “God for ever for his great mercies in Christ, so the  
 “other



“ other have cause to lament *their own wickedness, sin,*  
 “ *and contumacy of Christ,*” (actual, not original, sin,)  
 “ *which is the cause of their reprobation, and wherein we*  
 “ should look upon reprobation, as the only goodness  
 “ of God in Christ is the cause of our election and sal-  
 “ vation, wherein we should look upon God’s election.”  
 Bradford’s Meditations upon the Lord’s Prayer, &c. p.  
 270. See also “ Letters of Martyrs,” p. 409.

How completely Lutheran appears the doctrine of Trew, and how moderately Calvinistical (if Calvinistical it can be called) that of Bradford! That the former, although branded by its adversaries with the title of Pelagianism, prevailed much at this period, we may conclude from a passage in the Confession of J. Clement in the year 1556, who remarks, “ I do perceive,  
 “ that there is a wonderful sort of the Pelagians’ sect,  
 “ *swarming every where.*” Strype’s Eccles. Mem. vol.  
 iii. p. 219. Append,

Page 178, note (19).

Dr. Priestley, and other professed Socinians, have not confined themselves to mere insinuations on this head, but have expressly denominated those Articles, the illustration of which has been the object of these Lectures, *absurd*, and the majority of the Clergy, who subscribe them, *dishonest*. “ Instead of merely sub-  
 “ scribing their names to these Articles, as the Clergy  
 “ now do, I wish the experiment was made of making  
 “ them declare upon their honour, that they believe  
 “ them, as they are required to do, in the obvious, li-  
 “ teral, and grammatical sense of the words, and that  
 “ they make this declaration, as the settled principle  
 “ and conviction of their heart, as they hope for mer-  
 “ cy from the God of truth. This new mode would  
 “ at least make many of your Clergy *think* a little  
 “ more upon the subject, than they appear to have  
 “ done

“ done at present ; and your teachers, though believing *what I have clearly shewn to be exceedingly absurd, and manifestly unscriptural*, would at least be *honest*.” Priestley’s Letters to the Inhabitants of Birmingham, p. 123.

The passage at the conclusion of the Sermon is taken from the modest reply of Sebastian Castellio to the unmerited censures of Calvin. See Sermon II. note 18, p. 244.

THE END.











